DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 534 VT 009 988

TITLE	Education and Training in Correctional Institutions. Proceedings of a Conference.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. Federal Prison Industries, Inc.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	118p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education, University of Wisconsin, 1180 Observatory Drive, Room 4315, Social Science Building, Madison, Wisconsin 53706 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Conferences, *Corrective Institutions, Prisoners, *Speeches, *Training, *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The conference appraised the effects of educational and training programs in correctional institutions and emphasized analytical reports, research findings, and project evaluations. The speakers and participants at the meeting were officials from Federal and state agencies, and members from academic institutions engaged in research and extension activities. Five speeches were presented at the conference and rebuttal remarks were provided by other conference participants. The speeches were: (1) "Lessons Learned from Vocational Training Programs Given in a Prison Setting" by Curtis Aller, (2) "Management of Transfer from Jail to Community" by Clyde Sullivan, (3) "Employment Problems of Released Prisoners: Dimensions and Sociological Implications" by George Pownall, and (4) "Changing Inmates Through Education" by Calvin Michael. (BC)

ED037534

EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Proceedings of a Conference

Prepared by the Center for Studies
in Vocational and Technical Education

The University of Wisconsin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VT009988

ED032234

The Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education is affiliated with The Industrial Relations Research Institute.

This report was prepared under a contract with the United States Bureau of Prisons, Federal Prisons Industries, Inc., United States Department of Justice. Persons undertaking such project under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Justice.

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 68-65930

Copyright, 1968, by the Regents of

The University of Wisconsin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED
MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Regents of U. of Wiscon.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER
AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION.
FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM
REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

2000-53

CONTENTS

Page

Preface v

Participants vii

I
Donald McNeil, Chairman

Lessons Learned from Vocational Training Programs Given in a Prison Setting — Curtis Aller 3

Discussion — Jacob Kaufman 15
James Jacks 18

II
Richard Whinfield, Chairman

Management of Transfer from Jail to Community — Clyde Sullivan 23

Discussion — Robert Carter 35
John Galvin 40
John McKee 42

III
Garland Wollard, Chairman

Dinner Speech — Sanger Powers 47

IV
Marshall Colston, Chairman

Employment Problems of Released Prisoners: Dimensions and Sociological Implications — George Pownall 63

		Page
Discussion	Wallace Mandell	81
	Harold Starr	84
	Marshall Colston	87

V
Gerald Somers, Chairman

Changing Inmates Through Education	Calvin Michael	95
Discussion	Sidney Fine	106
	Sylvia McCollum	112
	Leon Leiberg	114

PREFACE

In recent years there has been a growing interest in the education and occupational preparation of inmates of correctional institutions. A widespread and growing number of special programs and experiments have been conducted by individual institutions, by state agencies, and through funds provided by the United States Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the United States Bureau of Prisons.

Although many of these programs have been too recently initiated to permit a conclusive evaluation of the results, there have been a significant number of reports of favorable outcomes, and a growing body of literature is being directed toward an appraisal of the early experience.

This conference, sponsored by The University of Wisconsin's Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education in cooperation with the Federal Prisons Industries, Inc. of the United States Department of Justice, is one of a series of conferences sponsored by the Center to appraise the effects of educational and training programs. The emphasis of the conference was placed on analytical reports, research findings, and project evaluations, rather than on general descriptive statements. The sessions served as a forum by which research findings were related to practitioners in the field, and it is hoped that they may thereby be translated into improved programs of education and training in correctional institutions. Speakers and other participants in the conference included officials from federal and state agencies, as well as members of academic institutions who are engaged in pertinent research and extension activities in the field of corrections.

Although the papers and discussions included in this report reach a generally favorable set of conclusions, they also sound notes of caution and point up serious problems which are still to be solved. It is noted that the concepts and techniques used in regular educational and training institutions cannot be transferred without change to a prison setting. Imaginative and innovative adaptations are required. Similarly, the process of adjustment after completion of the educational or training program must include exceptional measures of assistance to the former inmates.

While the major criteria for evaluation of the experimental programs analyzed in these reports are success in employment and reduction in recidivism, the papers also stress the emphasis to be given to changes in the attitudes and outlook of the inmates of correctional institutions. Of considerable importance in all of these favorable outcomes, are the facilities, activities, and attitudes of the communities surrounding the correctional institutions.

We are grateful to officials of the Federal Prisons Industries, Inc. for their assistance and support of this conference, and to the speakers and discussants for their participation and prompt preparation of their remarks for purposes of inclusion in these *Proceedings*. We are indebted to Karen Krueger for her invaluable aid at all stages of the planning and conduct of the conference and in the preparation of the *Proceedings*.

Gerald G. Somers
Co-Director

J. Kenneth Little
Co-Director

Madison, Wisconsin
August, 1968

PARTICIPANTS

Curtis Aller
Associate Manpower Administrator
Manpower Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

Robert Carter
Associate Research Criminologist
University of California at Berkeley

Marshall Colston
Specialist
The University of Wisconsin Extension

Sidney Fine
Senior Staff
The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research

John Galvin
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training

Allen Harbort*
Superintendent
Correctional Education
Division of Corrections
State of Wisconsin

James Jacks
Specialist
Rehabilitation Services Administration
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

---

*Discussion comments are not included.

Jacob Kaufman
Director
Institute for Research on Human Resources
The Pennsylvania State University

Leon Leiberg
Director
Project Challenge
National Committee for Children and Youth

Wallace Mandell
Director of Research
Staten Island Mental Health Society

Sylvia McCollum
Education Research Specialist
Bureau of Prisons
U. S. Department of Justice

John McKee
Director
Rehabilitation Research Foundation
Draper Correctional Center

Donald McNeil
Chancellor
University of Wisconsin Extension

Calvin Michael
Director
Center for Correctional Education
Eastern Michigan University

Sanger Powers
Director of Corrections
State of Wisconsin

George Pownall
Department of Sociology
Kent State University

Gerald Somers
Co-Director
The Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education
The University of Wisconsin

Harold Starr
Specialist
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University

Clyde Sullivan
Director
Social Restoration Research Center
Staten Island Mental Health Society

Richard Whinfield
Administrative Associate
The Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education
University of Wisconsin

Garland Wollard
Director of Education
Bureau of Prisons
U.S. Department of Justice

Section 1

Donald McNeil, Chairman

LESSONS LEARNED FROM VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS GIVEN IN A PRISON SETTING

CURTIS C. ALLER
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

INTRODUCTION

I want to thank Mr. Somers for giving me the opportunity to meet with a group of practitioners and researchers engaged in the challenging problem of administering training and other rehabilitative programs for the most disadvantaged sectors of our population.

In addition to the regular problems we face in the manpower field, coping with a population characterized by inadequate education and skill, broken homes and poverty backgrounds, and minority group membership, you in the correctional field have additional difficulties superimposed on you. You must administer programs with due concern for security control. You must deal with a disproportionate share of multi-problem ridden people. Even if you successfully impart skills, you must still overcome the distrust many employers have of persons with a prison record.

The 1960 decade has been an exciting and rewarding one for advocates of manpower training and employment programs, as evidenced in the proliferation of legislation and widespread national public support. One of the spin-offs of this new interest in the rehabilitative possibilities of training is the initiation of manpower programs in the correctional field which, hopefully, may contribute to lasting solutions to the national crime problem.

The research and demonstration programs which we have supported under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA) led to passage of Section 251 of the 1966 Amendments to the Act. This authorizes the development of a pilot program of prison inmate training in federal, state, and local correctional institutions. It will provide a proving ground for the implications of the research and experimental work under MDTA and other programs which I shall discuss today. Hopefully, it will prove the feasibility of establishing a full-scale, regularly funded, vocational training program in prisons.

Prison Training Projects Under MDTA

Many of the lessons which I shall cite have been based on the experiences we have had with our research project at Rikers Island in New York City and our experimental and demonstration projects at Draper Correctional Institution in Elmore, Alabama, and Lorton Youth Center in Lorton, Virginia.

The Rikers Island study, appropriately titled "Restoration of Youth Through Training" (RYT), divided 264, 16- to 21-year-old males into two groups. An experimental group of 137 trainees received an eight-week IBM machine training course and remedial education and supportive services. The control group of nontrainees consisted of 127 men who received none of these services. A one-year follow-up study compared the employment, recidivism, and other experiences of the groups and furnished us with valuable research evidence.

At Draper, we relied heavily on programmed learning material to give youth vocational skills in such occupational fields as barbering, electrical appliance repair work, and automotive mechanics. Vocational training was implemented by intensive vocational, personal, and family counseling, and basic education. Similarly, vocational training courses were given in food services, welding, and building maintenance in "Project Challenge" at Lorton. The unique features were the substantial inmate choice in vocational selection, experimentation with remedial education materials, and extensive post-release support.

I think we are very fortunate in having with us today the men who combined scholarship with action to carry out the programs mentioned above—Drs. Clyde Sullivan and Wallace Mandell of RYT, Dr. John McKee of the Draper project, and Dr. Leon Leiberg of Project Challenge.

Lessons Learned

Research in the field of corrections must make giant strides before we can talk definitely about lessons learned. We face the same problem in the manpower field, with the realization that we must shape programs using the best evidence that is currently available. Recognizing that we need considerably more in the way of scientific research results, I should like to highlight some of the major lessons we feel we have learned thus far.

A. The rate of recidivism for youthful offenders can be reduced as a result of vocational training, remedial education, and supportive service programs such as counseling and basic education.

B. Youthful offenders in short-term correctional institutions can absorb and benefit from programs of vocational training given in a prison setting.

C. Although as a group, offenders appear sufficiently motivated to want to improve their prospective employment status, the lack of suitable training programs in prisons denies them the opportunity to fulfill this objective and may often contribute to high recidivism rates.

D. Support and commitment to training programs should be secured from institutional staff at all levels.

E. In making assignments of inmates to vocational training, prison administrators should be wary of utilizing the conventional array of testing techniques which may serve as screening-out devices.

F. The course content of vocational training should mesh realistically with job opportunities available in the community to which ex-offenders will return.

G. Job development and job placement programs are crucial to the successful post-release adjustment efforts for ex-offenders; many employers still have a stereotyped image of ex-prisoners which may be changed through employer involvement as advisors and observers of rehabilitation efforts.

H. To have lasting and penetrating effect from rehabilitative programs initiated within the prison, ex-offenders must have an umbrella of supportive services such as counseling and social services available to them whenever needed in the outside community.

J. One general lesson we have learned in the administration of our social science research program is that to get good research, we must secure able researchers—preferably an interdisciplinary team that understands the problem and can communicate the lessons learned.

Let us examine some of these lessons in greater detail.

Reducing Recidivism

When we began planning our manpower training programs, we knew that the spotlight would be on the end results. How many people would get jobs because of our programs? How many would get jobs related to training? How many would be retained on their jobs?

The same questions were asked when we started our vocational training programs for offenders, with one addition. Would the vocational training help keep ex-offenders out of prison? From a researcher's viewpoint, I would question whether this is the essential question, especially in a program marked by experimentation where we are still groping for what works and what does not. Nevertheless, from the viewpoint of an administrator with limited funds for operating purposes and different programs crying for priority, such questions are significant. I am pleased to note that, based on our limited experience, we can say that vocational training and adjustment services do apparently help in post-release employment and reduce recidivism rates.

At Rikers Island, where more than 80 percent of the subjects had previous records of two or more arrests, the researchers measured recidivism based on return to jail within one year after release. Fifty-two percent of the youths who received IBM data processing training did *not* return to jail compared with only 34 percent of the men who did not receive training.

Even more significant, however, was the fact that we were able to achieve progress with subgroups in the Rikers Island population who had the poorest prognosis for success. In the case of the drug users group, we had been forewarned not to include them because their "high risk" rating precluded success. When all users, whether experimentals or controls, in RYT were grouped together, they recidivated at a much higher rate (71 percent) than non-users (49 percent). Analysis confined to the user group revealed, however, that only 55 percent of those in the training group returned to jail after one year as compared with 80 percent in the control group.

RYT also furnished research evidence that boys with a vocational high school background could benefit; only 37 percent of the trainee group with some years of vocational high school were jailed after one year, compared with two-thirds of the controls. As you probably know, many of the vocational schools attended by these boys have been dubbed "dumping grounds" because of the practice of using these schools as receiving centers for academic and behavioral "problems" from other schools. However, in our manpower research studies, we have also found that men with vocational school training find it valuable preparation for moving into skilled jobs, especially if the men have also had some training under apprenticeship or an on-the-job training program.

Post-release employment data on 228 people from the training project at Draper are just now being analyzed. Although there is no comparable information on a control group, there was an over-all low rate of recidivism in the group, 80 percent of whom had a prior record of imprisonment.

Underlying the favorable research evidence that recidivism rates can be reduced through training, is the even more basic fact that youthful offenders, even those in short-term correctional institutions, can benefit from and absorb vocational training given in a prison setting.

MOTIVATION FOR TRAINING

In the manpower field, we are interested in studies which probe the problem of motivating the disadvantaged to achieve positive attitudes toward training and work. However, the majority of prisoners apparently begin with favorable attitudes. They want, hope to get, and—when they are discharged—seek decent, steady jobs. But the fact is, they are apt to be hampered in this by their pre-incarceration syndrome of poor education, lack of skills, and sporadic employment experiences. Unfortunately, the majority of released prisoners are not exposed to meaningful training programs while in prison; therefore they usually cannot break out of their old employment patterns. In the field of corrections, it seems that disenchantment can set in early because the system does not provide the wherewithal to achieve employment goals.

Dr. Daniel Glaser, in his definitive study, found that learning a trade or in other ways preparing for a better job opportunity outside of the prison was the first interest of most inmates at every prison studied, and from his study of post-release activities he estimated that at least 90 percent of American prison releasees seek legitimate careers for a month or more after they leave prison.[1] These findings ought to make us devote considerable attention to the importance of training for jobs with some skill component which offers promise of stable employment.

---

[1] Daniel Glaser, *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964).

INITIATING AND DESIGNING VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

In discussing the initiation and design of training programs, I wish to single out several key areas. These include adjustments that may be necessary on the part of the institution and its staff, the bases for selection and assignment of inmates, and choosing the occupational areas of training and course content. Because we have learned that training is not the sole answer, that it must be backed up by a broad spectrum of social and other supportive services, I have reserved these for a separate discussion.

Institutional and Staff Roles

From our studies it is clear that the chances for the success of training programs are directly related to the commitment to the program's objectives from the chief administrator of the institution and all of his staff. In RYT, because of the unique combination of research with an ongoing training program, special efforts were made to explain the program to top staff and to have them explain it down the line. We were fortunate in having Dr. Anna Kross, then Commissioner of Correction in New York City, working right alongside us, offering her wholehearted and enthusiastic support for the RYT program. Her involvement helped facilitate support from staff at all levels in the long run.

It would be a mistake, however, to gloss over some of the difficulties encountered; it is not a simple matter to win unqualified support overnight for programs which the institutional staff may resist because of real or imagined interference with security routines or which taxpayers may resent as coddling. On this last point, it is most encouraging that some of the most responsive help has come from enlightened citizens in the outside community.

At some point, it will be necessary to clarify the relationship between prison industries, institutional maintenance activities, and the vocational training program. I do not wish to become enmeshed in the whole problem of differences in quality of programs which exist when we discuss production by prison industries in state as against federal institutions. Let me simply caution prospective administrators of training programs that you are the best judges as to whether the existing system offers real opportunities for inmates to absorb training. If it does not, I feel you are best advised to make a real distinction between your vocational training program and prison production or maintenance activities. The task of teaching a skill along with resocialization often requires special teaching and treatment techniques removed from the press of getting a particular job done.

Commitment of top staff will have little effect unless it is conveyed to the people who are actually in contact with the inmates. To give them the means for solid accomplishments, the functions and responsibilities of staff members and their respective roles must be explored. It is not easy to shake loose familiar, secure patterns of behavior in any activity; it is probably more difficult when that activity itself is maintaining security.

Selection for Training

We have learned as a result of research under our broad MDTA manpower program to be extremely wary of any hard and fast criteria with respect to the selection of applicants for training assignments. In the past, IQ was a sacred cow; we have now learned it is far from the relatively immutable measure it once was thought to be. I prefer to be guided by Dr. Glaser's observation that despite the deficiencies in their level of education, the intelligence of prisoners is not too different from the general population. Paper and pencil tests have discriminated most against many persons who, unfortunately, have been unwitting victims of our drop-out, push-out school system.

In the limited experience we have had under our prison research and experiment and demonstration studies, a wide range of approaches has been used. Lorton's Project Challenge decided against the use of traditional instruments such as ability and aptitude tests, interest inventories, disciplinary reports, and offense categories. Instead any inmate who expressed interest by filing an application form, met with a counselor, discussed the different vocational areas, and then made his choice from seven vocational areas.

At Rikers Island, we decided we would take only high school dropouts for the RYT program, provided, however, that they achieved a minimum score on the IBM aptitude tests and on the Revised Beta Test of Intelligence.

At Draper some tests are administered to prospective trainees, but standard norms are not used to screen out individuals, and unless test achievement is unusually sub-par, trainees are generally granted their training preference. Poor educational background did not seem to hamper 12 of the 14 Draper-trained welders who took and passed the American Welding Society's Examination for arc welder certification in the building trades which was given on the institution's grounds. In private industry, approximately two out of ten people pass this difficult test.

I should add that under our general research program we are probing whether it is meaningful for employers to insist that youngsters have a high school diploma for the many jobs where this requirement exists. Our prison training experience has already told us that the diploma is, in many cases, a deliberate barrier to employment—not a genuine requirement.

The Vocational Course Offerings and Content

When the prison administrator has to pick and choose among the various course offerings, perhaps the most decisive factor, and one to which the researcher often pays the least attention, is the element of cost. However, cost consideration aside, many special problems exist in correctional institutions which have no counterpart elsewhere. One of the most important lessons we learned under our regular MDTA program was to train persons for jobs where the potential for actual employment is high. In corrections, however, you may first have to ascertain if employment is barred because of a prison record. Ex-prisoners, in certain localities, may be denied a driver's license, or may be denied jobs in hotels or restaurants. The government has its own set of restrictive rules, although at the federal level information is now requested only on those arrests which were followed by convictions. However, even a person with a record of criminal conviction may be hired if adjudged a good employment risk.

I would agree in general that there has been some relaxation among employers in giving priority to skills, and looking beyond a prison record. However, I feel we still have some way to go. For example, a survey conducted among 983 firms in 1966 by the Minnesota Division of Adult Corrections found that almost 40 percent of the respondents indicated at least a general reluctance to hire offenders for any position. Another 28 percent would hire them for specific jobs only. At Draper, staff personnel observed that the same employers who are willing to employ ex-inmate graduates in entry level jobs may be unwilling to advance them to positions of responsibility.

While it is obvious that correctional administrators must give serious consideration to the foregoing in selecting vocational curriculums, he also has other problems. What is the occupational structure of the geographic area to which the releasee will ultimately return? This is especially important for federal prisons. Other general factors we have learned to watch are the average duration of incarceration, and, of course, the general age level of the institution's inmate population.

RYT alerted us to the preference that many employers have for training and developing their own work forces. Prospective employers preferred to hire for the lowest entry job. This would mean that training which emphasizes core-type courses or the most basic skills may be preferable to those where technical specialization is predominant.

The mix and timing of different kinds of course work is also important. Many inmates need remedial education in the "3 R's." How should this be related to the skill training? At Rikers Island, after some experimentation, it was found that the most efficient and attention-getting method was one where alternative scheduling was followed, remedial education classes given one day and vocational training the next. At Lorton, a complete integration was effected. The basic remedial education component was made more meaningful not only by its content being clearly relevant to tasks required on the job, but also by being offered in the shop classes rather than in the classroom. Under this approach, Lorton trainees' scores improved on a vocational education curriculum test as much or more than control groups, in half the instruction time or less.

Thus far, I have not mentioned the system of work release which is being utilized so effectively, although on a limited scale, in federal prisons and in many state institutions. Under the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965, the same legislation which authorized the work-release program for federal correctional institutions, there are also provisions for inmates to be released to attend educational classes and vocational training courses in the community. The need to take advantage of the vast storehouse of training resources which are opened up by this Act is obvious. The number of vocational areas and the level of skill training available to offenders will expand with increased use of the facilities, and instructors in the free communities' schools and even colleges.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

There is little doubt that adequate supportive services must be provided so that the training effort can bear fruit. I shall refer only briefly to some approaches for furnishing basic supportive needs, since other speakers will explore these more fully.

Placement and Job Development

Effective job development is the capstone of the entire process we have been discussing. Staff in our projects have found that one of the pervasive problems was overcoming the employers' stereotyped images of ex-prisoners. This was met most effectively by inviting potential employers to visit the training facilities. Resistance melted as they came to appreciate the levels of skill developed through the programs.

To make the pioneering placements of the Rikers Island trainee-graduates took an average of 30 mail, phone, or personal contacts per placement. We do not have comparable figures from other projects but evidence indicates that intensive efforts were necessary in all projects.

An essential feature of effective placement, aside from the matching of skills with requirements, is to see that the employer or supervisor is acquainted with the kinds of personal support the trainee is likely to need, relative to day-to-day, on-the-job relationships. Let me suggest that we take a leaf from our most recent experience under MDTA and seriously consider the use of "job coaches," to be available on a one-to-one basis to help releasees cope with any kind of distressful event that can affect their employment situation.

Advisory Committees

When advisory committees from labor and industry are used for technical assistance in training programs they can form a very strong bridge to the community in opening up job opportunities as well as marshalling community support for the program in other areas, such as the procurement of equipment, instructors for the institutional training, and social services.

Social Services

Community social service agencies may assign low priority to requests for services to the multi-handicapped ex-offender. However, since they are likely to have served either the releasee or his family in the past, they are in a good position to provide information on the releasee and to deliver coordinated services to him. In RYT, we found the shortage of social service facilities to be a major bottleneck; the RYT staffers had to create their own helping agencies for ex-RYT trainees in the community.

Fidelity Bonding

Difficulties in obtaining jobs faced by trainees from our prison projects led to an amendment to the MDTA to authorize a pilot bonding program which uses federal funds to subsidize bonding for ex-offenders unable to obtain commercial bonding. Bonds under this program were used by only 5 percent of the Draper graduates, but job developers here as elsewhere report that many employers hire releasees without bond, after learning that the individuals are in fact bondable.

Counseling

Counseling activity cannot be completely divorced from other activities. It may be related to the job search, e.g., to interview behavior, to daily working relationships, or to personal problems. In the community, as in the prison, voluntary personnel such as Vista volunteers, given proper orientation, can play a strong role as helping agents in the inmates' post-release adjustment process. This is documented in the Lorton report.

Incentives to Learning

Learning needs to become a rewarding experience for inmates instead of a humiliating one which repeats past failures. Incentives can be built into the learning process itself, since the ultimate incentive—a job outside—can seem very distant and unreal to the inmate. Incentives offered trainees have included program insignia, proficiency certificates, class trophies, access to trade journals and periodicals, and graduation exercises—in addition to monetary incentives. The latter, at Draper, was found to increase academic achievement, as measured by the number of tests passed during training.

Loan Funds

Funds are a pressing need for most individuals beginning with their first day of release. The usual "gate money" is inadequate. Some loan or grant arrangements have been established with varying degrees of success. However since loans will not be repaid in full in all cases, a revolving fund arrangement which has built-in flexibility, is recommended.

The corrections system is in a unique and transitional stage today. In effect, prison institutions are being asked to truly correct what the established institutions in the free sector of our society have been unable to accomplish—to take the most disadvantaged in our society and give them new skills and new hope so they will "make it" on their next try as free citizens. In this task, you have wisely asked for university support to help improve the skills of personnel in correctional institutions and to attract those with broader training to help provide the diverse services needed by offenders. Many prison administrators have already demonstrated their willingness to cooperate in finding new ways to educate, train, and help restore offenders to community life.

As one engaged in administering manpower programs, I know that our objective of providing more trained manpower will be strengthened in direct proportion to the success of your efforts. There is probably no more potent tool with which we can provide a man bent on redeeming himself, than the confidence and self-respect that can come with mastery of a skill and a job which utilizes that skill. I realize, as you well do, that we have been able to muster only limited resources thus far in this effort. We in the manpower field hope to continue to share with you in accumulating the knowledge needed to make further progress and hope that ultimately we shall have resources commensurate with the requirements of this vast venture in human reclamation.

DISCUSSION

JAMES C. JACKS
REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

I certainly appreciate the opportunity of participating in a conference concerned with such a vital and urgent subject. It is a special honor to me to discuss Mr. Aller's presentation which I found most informative. Mr. Aller's interest in corrections and the high priority he places on dissemination and utilization of research findings is well known and respected.

Since I am limited to only a few minutes discussion, I will restrict my remarks to a single important aspect of Mr. Aller's paper and its relevancy to research in vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. Aller, in discussing the legislative authorization for research and demonstration projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act, states: "Hopefully, it will prove the feasibility of establishing a full-scale, regularly funded, vocational training program in prisons." Unfortunately, this has not always proven to be the case in many federally funded research and demonstration projects. All too often we accumulate considerable research data from both basic and applied research, but we do not follow it up in practice. One of the desired outcomes of a research project, after its feasibility and usefulness have been demonstrated, is its assumption by an ongoing agency as a regular activity, perhaps on a broader scale than the original project. Achievement of this desired outcome, however, should be considered not only at the conclusion of a project, but also before the project is initiated—in the proposal. The funding agency of a project should obtain a policy commitment from the operating agency to insure that steps are taken to promote implementation and continuation after research and demonstration support has been phased out. Unless someone is responsible for seeing that such steps are taken, considerable lag or the complete dropping of a successful project can be expected.

The vocational rehabilitation program is unique, or possibly a better word would be fortunate, in that it has an ongoing service program through which to disseminate and utilize the findings gained from research. The mainstay of the vocational rehabilitation program has traditionally been the direct rehabilitation services provided to clients under the basic support program. Furthermore, the vocational rehabilitation research and demonstration program has existed as an integral and essential part of this program. The effectiveness of the research program in vocational rehabilitation has best been measured by its impact on program development—and program development in the area of correctional rehabilitation is experiencing unusually dramatic growth.

A good example of the successful incorporation of a research project into an ongoing vocational rehabilitation service program is one conducted by the South Carolina Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. The primary purpose of this project was to discover what policies, program innovation, therapeutic procedures, and personnel were necessary to successfully serve the public offender. Data regarding the first 625 offenders referred to the project staff were analyzed. Of these 625 referrals, 413 accepted service, 232 continued to participate throughout the program, and 160 were successfully rehabilitated. The project was conducted for a three-year period. Additional follow-up information was obtained regarding the vocational adjustment of the first 112 project clients rehabilitated. The following are a few of the variables examined:

1. the influence of class variables such as age, race, sex, education, and vocational level on clients' participation and success in the project;

2. whether the nature or severity of offenses committed influenced rehabilitation;

3. the influence of home and family conditions on rehabilitation;

4. an inventory of the range of medical, psychiatric, and psychological diagnostic services provided clients in order to determine needs and to build a body of knowledge about this population; and

5. follow-up information regarding successfully rehabilitated clients in order to determine their attitudes toward their jobs, relationships with co-workers, and their productivity as evaluated by their employers.

The following are some of the significant results and suggestions which were formulated as a result of both clinical observations and statistical analysis:

1. Personality characteristics and needs are more important as vocational determinants than intelligence, interests, or aptitudes.

2. The public offender tends to perform better in concrete, nonjudgmental jobs than in employment where abstract conceptualizing is required.

3. Jobs which produce immediate satisfaction seem to be best suited for this type of client.

4. Long-term, high-level training goals do not usually lead to satisfactory job placement.

5. The counselor should use the dependency needs of certain clients as a means of encouraging them to continue in the rehabilitation program.

6. Job stability seems greatest in employment which enables the offender's hostility to be discharged in a harmless fashion.

7. Goals and plans developed while clients are institutionalized are usually modified or abandoned soon after release.

In speaking on this project, Dr. Dill Beckman, director of the South Carolina Vocational Rehabilitation Department, states: "Through this experimental program, we in South Carolina have sought to demonstrate that knowledge and skills developed by vocational rehabilitation through the years can be translated into rehabilitation services for persons who have been convicted of legal transgressions."[1] This has certainly proven to be the case. The incorporation of this research project into the ongoing vocational rehabilitation program has resulted in one of the most extensive vocational rehabilitation programs for public offenders in the country.

The achievement of this type of effective use of research is accomplished only through comprehensive planning at the proposal stage of a research project. A research and demonstration project should be formulated to include a complete cycle of research and application—beginning with basic research, proceeding to demonstration of new techniques, and concluding with the continued operation of the project if it is found feasible and useful.

---

[1] C. S. Chandler, & B. A. Sandick, *Rehabilitating Public Offenders* (Columbia: South Carolina Vocational Rehabilitation Department, 1968).

JACOB J. KAUFMAN
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The purpose of these comments is to raise issues for discussion rather than to be critical of the paper presented by Mr. Aller.

It seems to me that in a discussion of the education and training of persons in correctional institutions there is a tendency to assume that if a man is given general education and specific skill training, he will be well prepared to return to and participate in society. This is similar to the approach usually found in vocational education in the secondary schools. It would appear from the results of research conducted in the whole area that education and training may be a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for the rehabilitation of offenders who are in correctional institutions. It would be desirable, in this connection, to develop experimental programs to determine what other conditions are necessary.

In an experiment to be conducted by the Institute for Research on Human Resources, The Pennsylvania State University, an attempt will be made to determine whether the teaching of humanities will help youthful offenders to rebuild and revitalize their understanding of themselves and the meaning of their lives. Can the insights and wisdom of creative artists change the negative self-concepts of these youths so that they can acquire a sense of personal identity?

This project, financed by the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, points to the direction in which education and training must go if we are to truly rehabilitate offenders and minimize recidivism.

This approach, recognized by some as worthwhile for exploration, will have to take place in a social and political environment which is growing more hostile to the treatment of offenders to society. The current emphasis on "law and order," criticism of Supreme Court decisions which have been concerned with the individual rights of offenders, and the public's concern over "coddling" of offenders, all tend to resist the new (and presumably correct) approaches.

Another obstacle is the internal resistance in correctional institutions to changes in their educational and training programs. In many institutions there has developed a "humaneness" toward the offender, and the personnel, after considerable resistance, has been able to introduce better education and training programs. For such personnel an examination of the adequacy of their programs—measured by successful rehabilitation—is exceedingly (and understandably) difficult.

Finally, a new approach might bring the new curriculum into conflict with the security needs of the institution, a problem not easily resolved.

In general, it is suggested that a radical revision take place in the thinking of the types of educational programs necessary to assist the offender in making an appropriate adjustment to society. The willingness of the federal government to support such programs is to be commended. But the approach must be broadened and the programs must be conducted at the state and local levels, where the needs are greatest and where the resources are most limited.

Section II

Richard Whinfield, Chairman

THE MANAGEMENT OF TRANSITION FROM JAIL TO COMMUNITY

CLYDE E. SULLIVAN
STATEN ISLAND MENTAL HEALTH SOCIETY AND
NEW JERSEY COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

In the long view of historical development, the practice of using *imprisonment* as a way of punishing law breakers is, relatively, a modern development. Until the nineteenth century, jails were places where offenders were held to ensure their presence at trial or execution. In those days, if a person was found guilty and was sentenced to a lesser punishment than death, he might have a hand or finger chopped off, or be branded, flogged, or perhaps banished. The idea of substituting imprisonment as a punishment appeared in the early part of the nineteenth century as a reaction against the brutality of these ancient punishments and as part of the new evaluation of human life that began to emerge as a powerful influence in that era. The idea that this confinement could be used as a means to correct the offender, to incline him towards penitence and conformity, followed as a corollary. In Pennsylvania, the Quakers developed a carefully reasoned and logically designed structure and philosophy to facilitate such penitence and change. They believed that if an offender were isolated from all human contact, made to toil with his hands in loneliness, and given ample time for quiet reflection, Bible reading, and introspection, he would, from within himself, be able to discover the error of his ways and repent, returning to society with an inward commitment to abide by the law.

This treatment did not produce the results for which the kindly Quakers had hoped. The depersonalization and loss of human perspective caused by such deliberate, total isolation were so pervasive and the effects of unremitting toil at boring, unrewarding work were so destructive that the primary operational elements of the system had to be dropped.

Subsequent modifications eased the intensity of isolation and reduced the amount of gross personal damage that could be identified as an outgrowth of the pattern of treatment. However, the basic dynamics of the interaction between society and the convict were not altered, and many of the more subtle assaults on the integrity of the individual were retained with varying degrees of awareness among professionals as to what had been retained and what had been dropped.

Moreover, by the time that there was general awareness that all of the implications of using imprisonment as punishment had not been anticipated correctly, a massive investment had been made. Hundreds of highly expensive, escape-proof jails and prisons had been erected. Built with tons of stone, steel, and concrete, they were constructed to withstand assault from within and from without. They were built to last—and they have! A few states had the courage to admit publicly that they had made a mistake and, though it was costly, demolished these structures and started to build anew. Other jurisdictions attempted piecemeal adaptations and have tried to rationalize traditional architecture and programs with modern thought or have rejected new ideas as impractical. Thus, for example, the original prototype of the Pennsylvania plan at Cherry Hills still stands and is in use in Philadelphia. Similarly in Connecticut, a jail built in Revolutionary War days is still in active use. Those are only two of the most dramatic examples—there are many others scattered throughout the country.

We also continue to face the same dilemma that faced the early managers of these now aging bastilles. We know how to hold people securely. In fact, technically we have "improved" in this respect; our steel is more escape-proof, and we now have a variety of electronic devices for watching, locking and unlocking, detecting weapons and contraband, etc., but we still struggle with the problem of how to hold people without damaging them in the process, and we still do not know how to let go!

Nearly a century ago, Gabriel Tarde described this dilemma. His words are as pertinent today as they were when he wrote them.

> Malefactors are a peculiar type of big game, which we find very difficult to capture, which we do not know what to do with when captured, and which it is as dangerous to release as it is embarrassing to hold. To transfer a man abruptly from a hermetically closed cell to the full liberty of the released offender, or rather of the predestined recidivist, is like making an invalid who has been bedridden for several months get up and go out to run in the open air.

I want to consider two sets of definitions which I believe are instrumental in maintaining the unhappy balance of this predicament.

First, the conception of *Man* which underlies our use of imprisonment has assumed an innate malevolence in human nature. In recent years, this ancient concept has been phrased in quite sophisticated ways by social scientists as well as by theologians, but the basic prescriptions for action on the part of society differ from earlier prescriptions only in being more humane. The role played by social institutions based upon such a conception is essentially repressive in character. It implies that the chief occupation of the family, the school, the church, the community, and correctional institutions is to inhibit and control. Under these circumstances, deviance generally is defined as resulting from *personal* rather than from *institutional* deficiency. Responsibility and criticism can be deflected from the social structure and focused upon shortcomings in the individual deviant. The prescription for treatment is straightforward and simple. Individual deficiencies should be diagnosed; within practical limits, whatever is missing should be supplied. The possibilities and combinations are nearly unlimited. They range from individual psychotherapy through remedial education, vocational training, and work experience to various physical therapies and interventions. All this should take place within a stable, controlled institutional framework which minimizes conflict between society and the deviant and which provides a predictable pattern of reward and punishment so that the individual will internalize these values and assign legitimacy to the rules and regulations of his society. Despite their apparent scope and complexity, these prescriptions are essentially conservative and tend to justify and perpetuate prevailing patterns of cultural, societal, and institutional practice.

A second set of definitions contributing to the present ambiguity and "irrational equilibrium" maintained by modern correctional practice is concerned with the role of work in the lives of prisoners. The use of work as punishment considerably antedates the use of imprisonment as punishment. In Roman times, for example, public offenders often were sentenced to work in the mines or to other heavy, demeaning, and arduous work that was deemed to be beneath the dignity of a citizen. Similarly, in seafaring cultures, offenders might be sentenced to serve a term in the galleys. Surveillance, chaining, and other restrictions of liberty were conceived simply as practical measures necessary to make sure that the sentence was carried to completion and that labor was provided. One essential feature of such sentences was that the convict worked without payment or compensation. He received the minimum amount of food, clothing, and care required to maintain his potential economic value.

The classical judicial phrase "Condemned to *X* number of years in the galleys, on rations and without pay" sums up the basic features of a formula that spans time and has been invoked repeatedly across the centuries with only minor variations arising from cultural or technological differences. Thus, one modern criminologist has suggested that "... the convict condemned to hard labour was the galley-slave on land, removed from the sea more because of progress in navigation than for any reason connected with progress in penology."

As a basic formula for dealing with certain categories of offenders, this practice and orientation toward work continued as an explicit, formally accepted pattern well into the nineteenth century. Further, although it has been repudiated officially by most criminologists and correctional administrators in the twentieth century, it still exists as an awkward residual of beliefs and practices which frequently is rationalized but which continues to exert a significant influence on practical operations in every correctional system of the world.

The penal reforms which began in the latter part of the eighteenth century did not challenge basic attitudes and conceptions about the role of work in a prison setting. Instead, many ancient themes were retained and assimilated. It required little conceptual modification to accept the idea that the restriction of liberty which had been incidental to forced labor could itself be a punishment. Since most men avoided painful, degrading work, it was assumed that such work might have a "repressive" effect and would reinforce the pressures required to bring an offender to a "penitential" frame of mind. Work thus became a stressful, humiliating intensification of the sentence. The ultimate expression of this point of view came somewhat later as prisons were barred legally from engaging in productive activities that would bring them into competition with the production of the free labor market. When this happened, the prescription requiring prisoners to work was retained, but now they were caused to labor at hard, monotonous tasks which were useless and unproductive, e.g., moving rocks from one side of an enclosure to another.

At first glance, it may seem somewhat contradictory to note that this peculiar blend of attitudes about work and punishment in prison emerged during the same period of time as the democratic revolution. Early in this period John Locke, for example, had argued that labor was the basis for the right to private property. He believed that "...every man has a property in his own person. The labor of his body and the work of his hands... are properly his." Whatever man was able to take from nature, from the common domain that was God's gift to mankind, by his own labor rightfully became his property. Similarly, Adam Smith declared that "... the property which every man has in his own labor, as it is the original foundation of all other property, so it is the most sacred and inviolable."

I am inclined to believe that it was partly because of this conception of the relationship between productive work and the right to participate in political life that prison work came to be defined differently and was more closely related to punishment than to work in general. Thus, if the right to work is conceived as a democratic right, inseparable from the rights of citizenship, a convicted thief might be held to have abdicated his claim to equal rights to work because he did not support himself as a good citizen by honest labor. In support of this trend of thought, we may note that Immanuel Kant, writing during this period, took the position that "... every one who is compelled to maintain himself not according to his own industry, but as arranged by others... are without civil personality, and their existence is only, as it were, incidentally included in the state." While Kant was talking primarily about women, children, and apprentices, his words aptly describe the limbo occupied by many convicts of that era.

There were also some milder voices during that period of development, John Howard among them, who argued that diligent participation in *meaningful* work while in prison would be a more effective means of promoting moral and social rehabilitation of prisoners.

Over the intervening years, there has been increasing acceptance of the idea that work should not be used as punishment, but as a method of *treating* offenders. Even so, many reservations are expressed with regard to the practicality of this concept. For example, during the First United Nations Congress (Geneva, 1955) which adopted a resolution to the effect that "work is not to be conceived as additional punishment but as a means of furthering the rehabilitation of the prisoner...." One of the leading criminologists of the world "... declared that he was bound to admit, taking an exact and realistic view, that in certain cases, especially where short terms of imprisonment were involved, the question was not so much that of giving treatment in the strict sense as simply of keeping the prisoner occupied and maintaining order in the establishment... precisely for treatment purposes some prisoners should be excluded from working..." and finally, "... that the unskilled work provided by the majority of prisons could hardly be considered as treatment for those who, before coming to the prison, had been qualified workers."

There also are contradictions between theory and practice. Thus, there are still laws which allow men to be sentenced to "separate and solitary confinement at hard labor" and while it is a rarity, since most prison administrators do not follow the letter of the law, it is still possible to find examples of the older, harsh practices.

The problems with which we are struggling arise in part because we have not decided whether the work required for the maintenance of society is to be interpreted uniformly across all levels of society as a curse or as a blessing. This is unfortunate because work and occupation are linked to social status in our industrial society and have a profound effect on the development of self-confidence, personal identity, and the capacity to be an effective self-manager. Further, man and society tend to interact in ways which cause him to become what his fellowmen imply that he is now.

Therefore, if society seriously desires to reduce recidivism, prisoners should have an opportunity to know that work, or training for work, has the same nature, as much meaning, and the same social value as work or training in the free community. The right of society to punish the offender and to restrict his freedom may limit the *full* exercise of his right to work but should not deprive him of that right. The problem of competition between his work and the work of the free world outside should not be judged strictly as an economic matter but should be approached as a fundamental problem of respect for human rights. Finally, the idea that work in prison is more closely related to punishment than to general patterns of work in the world at large should be abandoned completely.

Social beliefs and the legal codes and procedures which have evolved to control human behavior rarely are changed by social scientists delivering papers or reporting on research findings at scientific meetings. Human beliefs and laws change only as persistent, serious problems or crises appear to challenge prevailing systems and codes. Even then, unless the crisis is large enough or insistent enough to shatter the code, it is probable that whatever legislation is generated will be aimed at reducing specific problems rather than solving general underlying causes. The simple fact is that society clings to traditional concepts long after meaning has been lost, hoping that things can be patched up and made to last a little longer. One of the most difficult of all human tasks is the task of taking a mass of well-known information and reorganizing it so that it can be viewed in new ways.

So, I am not overly optimistic that society is going to quickly solve the basic underlying contradictions in the correctional dilemma. For some time to come I expect that most prisoners detained or sentenced in the jails and prisons of the United States will be damaged by the experience.

Many kindly, dedicated, and intelligent people are working very hard to design, staff, and administer correctional institutions to offset the possibility of such damage and to make the institutions into effective rehabilitation centers. To this end, educational training and treatment programs have been developed and tailored to the needs of the various individuals and offender populations. Therapeutic communities and group counseling and review programs which use peer group relationships and group dynamics to develop responsibility and personal strength have been instituted. All these usually are beneficial and important activities. Often they have stimulated remarkable changes and achievements in individuals. But even in those instances, there is no evidence that the injury inflicted by imprisonment itself has been eliminated.

I am not denying the importance of these institutional rehabilitation programs. I think it would be unfair to expect that they *could* do more than slow the process of prisonization. At best this might occur as a by-product of their major function. For the most part, these efforts are designed as compensatory programs to compensate for deficiencies that were present prior to incarceration. The point is, that *when a living organism is immobilized, vitality is impaired.* This is true even when immobilization is required for the welfare of the organism, as with a broken bone immobilized in a cast.

Since we have no better solution than to handicap and immobilize certain categories of offenders and since we can only slow and explain the atrophy and impairment that results, we must take responsibility for providing the structure, support, and opportunity for restoration. At the present time in our society, I do not believe this can be accomplished within an institution because it requires a *transactional* relationship with society and with responsible people in the community which only can be artificially approximated in an institutional setting.

The core of successful social restoration is most reasonably built around relationships with the world of work. Although social class and subcultural values introduce some variations, self-management as an adult is dependent upon the effectiveness with which the adult can establish transactional relationships which are meaningful in his terms with the world of work. To be free of the threat that social agencies may be able to intervene and take over his life, he must develop a successful style and pattern in these transactions, negotiating for enough money to meet his needs, to pay his bills, and to be able to open himself to the vulnerability of caring for others who may be dependent upon him.

The mere acquisition of skills for which there are openings in the job market will not cause inmates to perceive human relationships from the viewpoint of free citizens working in similar jobs. But, if training can be related to job placement in the community where there is a chance of altering reference group relationships, post-release associations, and inmate perceptions of alternative patterns of response, training can be used as a springboard to change. Training young men to be IBM operators, as we did, may not affect criminality directly, but it does open the possibility of a new look at the world of work and opens the individual to different experiences and new options in deciding how he might spend his life. Further, such special programming provides an opportunity to manage the transition from jail to community so that ex-prisoners can be moved into situations which are dominated by essentially noncriminal social relationships. If they can be supported in that transition so the experience is successful and rewarding, the social situation can be a base for developing identification with noncriminal persons, values, and resources. Such experiences and commitments reduce the likelihood of recurrent delinquency. Ordinarily, both the working situation and the home neighborhood of the released offender are saturated with attitudes and structural elements conducive to delinquency.

In the Social Restoration and Wakoff Research Centers of the Staten Island Mental Health Society, we have begun to see that we can establish a network of social relationships and a condition of enough mutual trust so that ex-prisoners will risk the strain of such a social restoration experience. Our first experiences were not altogether successful, however. When we first placed ex-prisoners in high quality, good paying jobs, we found that they were:

1. Ambivalent about aspiring to new work roles and identifications;
2. Upset by the emotional and social demands generated by the flow of work in ordinary work settings;
3. Handicapped in the personal-social reorganization required for self-regulated performance by deeply entrenched psychological defenses and social techniques; and

4. Returning to family and friendship patterns which reinforced older self-concepts and hindered the development of new perceptions and adjustments.

Some employers and surveys have suggested that offenders are not motivated to work. Our experience in Restoration of Youth through Training, however, indicates that it is not so much a matter of motivation as lack of self-confidence and willingness to risk the losses and stress that can occur as a result of radical shifts in social roles. For example, one of the initial surprises for the RYT job placement staff was that subjects who were interested, enthusiastic, and successful during the training phases were distinctly reluctant, and apparently unmotivated, to seek jobs in data processing after release. One such boy who had been given a $500 scholarship by a private technical school to continue study suddenly stopped going to the school and did not tell anyone about it. Later, in the follow-up interview, he said simply, "...I was scared...of the teacher and everybody....I didn't think I was going to make it." Yet the school's records showed that he was doing reasonably well. The young adult who has no feeling of mastery and competence is not likely to appear motivated.

Other attitudes generate similar effects. Another trainee commented, "I'd get to wondering how many of them knew about my record...." The problems of transition which are implied in this expression of anxiety are potent factors in the work situation which reduces comfort, concentration, and effectiveness. The dynamics are almost identical to those reported by minority group persons facing integrated work settings. Of course, when the ex-prisoner happens to be a member of a racial minority, as was true for many RYT subjects, there is potential double preoccupation and anxiety.

Even when work activities and the job itself are interesting, the ex-prisoner may have difficulty in contending with people on the job. Thus, when one of the RYT trainees was pressed for an explanation of why he had left a job in an IBM unit of a large company for a series of low paying, short-term jobs, he made the following explanation: "Well...I have this walk...kind of a swinging, jiving, walk like,... and my supervisor, she didn't like it....She didn't want me to do it when I took things to other departments."

Raising employability levels for young men entering the labor market after serving time in jail is essentially a problem of stimulating and managing an upward social mobility. This does not imply an intention to transmit a broad range of middle-class values to lower-class and working-class youth. Rather, what is required is a new social role in work, with enough support, and a sufficiently detailed *script* for performing the new social role in the work setting so that the individual can "pass" or adapt successfully. Further, more than a single, isolated block of service is needed. Continuity of service really begins in the jail and extends beyond the first job in the community. The prescription for action on the part of the social restoration worker is twofold: First, the worker is to establish or renew a network of social relationships and access to social resources needed by the ex-prisoner for acceptable functioning in the community; second, the *task* of social restoration is essentially one of helping develop an awareness and certainty of personal identity, consistency, and continuity as a result of successful transactions in a daily work experience in the free community.

At a minimum, the worker charged with social restoration responsibilities must have sound working relationships with the legal agencies who can intervene in the life of the ex-prisoner, access to other social service agencies in the community, access to the world of work and to entry-level jobs with career ladder potential, and the capacity to transfer these relationships and opportunities to his client.

Relationships with legal agencies: An ex-prisoner is likely to continue to have official contacts with police, courts, and probation and parole officers. Because these can be powerful influences in his life, it is important to establish direct working relationships with personnel in other agencies so that policies can be coordinated, and procedures and decisions can be shared in order to reduce conflict and surprise.

Relationships with other social agencies: The social restoration worker operating from a base in corrections must develop sound working relations with the family of social agencies in his community. There has been an unfortunate tendency for corrections to seek to develop its own full array of services because they have been relatively isolated from resources already existing in the community. This has resulted in understaffed, underbudgeted, and makeshift duplication. Moreover, it tends to create a situation which increases the chances that the ex-prisoner will be labeled publicly and treated differently. Such a pattern undermines the basic objectives of social restoration. The ex-prisoner should have an opportunity to learn to operate within the same expectancies faced by other workers. Finally, employers are besieged with multiple requests for jobs by representatives of many handicapped groups. Even if corrections develops its own placement service, it is likely to be at the bottom of the totem pole in approaching employers.

If correctional agencies are to become an accepted member of the family of social service agencies in the community, they must establish reciprocal relationships which allow other agencies to influence what happens to the clients who are shared.

Access to the world of work: This is essentially the business of job development. We really don't know as much as we think we should about this area. We do know, however, that job development entails much more than "job finding." A job finder, for example, is apt to turn up a large number of openings but will complain that you are not supplying him with the right kind of people to fill the jobs. The job developer, on the other hand, may be working to engineer openings where none existed, or to redefine qualifications, or to reduce meaningless restrictions, etc. This obviously is a complex assignment, requiring a person of skill and knowledge in the world of work and the world of social restoration.

It is of prime importance to know who the gatekeepers to jobs really are and the nature of the gatekeeping assignments. Access to some jobs is controlled exclusively by the employers. Access to other jobs is possible only through unions or trade associations. Sometimes it is possible to avoid some of these gatekeepers. Thus, in RYT at the outset, since we were dealing with a single work skill, it was possible to negotiate with specific employers. Subsequently, however, when multiple entries to the world of work were required, it became mandatory to deal with a variety of gatekeepers. There was a need for knowledge of shifts in the hiring climate, sympathetic employers, and ways of getting support from employees, and for a network of relationships that were not available in the correctional system. In this more complex world, it became necessary to have the guidance and strength of an Advisory Committee of Management and Organized Labor Unions.

The more that is known about the selection and hiring problems of any single employer, the more effective the job developer is likely to be. For example, we found a number of employers who were willing to hire ex-prisoners but were afraid that unions or other employees would be resistant. In some cases we were able to bridge some of these gaps.

Only when there is such a base of knowledge, sound communication, and awareness of problems is there a chance to modify, redefine, and engineer jobs for our peculiarly handicapped group. A job which is currently viewed as a dead end may be redefined as a step on a career ladder.

Sometimes our job developers were able to modify hiring restrictions. For example, unrealistic educational requirements may be a barrier. If an employer can be caused to review the educational levels actually required for performance in an entry level position, some openings can be created. Particularly where skill shortages exist is there an opportunity to modify prejudices and unnecessary hiring restrictions. Similarly, restrictions sometimes block access to career ladders, e.g., civil service for ex-inmates.

A skilled job developer who knows the community, the labor market, and the employers may show how the time of a skilled employee can be used more efficiently by separating out tasks requiring a lesser order of experience and skill. These lesser order tasks may then be organized into an entry-level job. Such redefinition and creation of jobs requires a high degree of acceptance from employers and demands a detailed and up-to-date knowledge of the specific working situation. In our experience, only the Advisory Committee and the unions who engaged themselves with our problems were effective in taking this approach. Retired union men were particularly useful.

It is probably misleading to describe such service functions as job development. The employer develops the job—the correctional person is a catalyst.

Incidentally, if you start using people like this to redefine work roles in the community, you must be prepared to modify training programs to mesh with the realities of the world of work as they are discovered and identified. Thus, in one project, our Advisory Committee reworked our curricula—updating and reshaping the program to keep pace with the job market.

Two final requisites should be noted in mounting a social restoration service: The client himself must be intimately and directly engaged with the process of decision-making and should be aware of the frame of reference being used to guide decisions.

This requires a clear and coordinated understanding on the part of staff and a general commitment to social restoration philosophy and objectives.

DISCUSSION

ROBERT M. CARTER
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Dr. Sullivan's paper began with a resume of our correctional heritage. It is significant that he started with the correctional tradition, for it is this very tradition which conflicts with our potential for real progress, leaves us mired in the past, and serves to channel our efforts without reference to the enormous social and political changes of our time. While tradition is often comforting to those of us in corrections, it is unrealistic to address the mounting problems of crime and delinquency by application of principles and methods developed decades ago and which have not, since their inception, evoked more than minimal change. Correctional systems will have to change, however, if for no other reason than the increased number of offenders being processed through them. Our tradition suggests that we make the necessary changes by increasing probation and parole staff, prison personnel, and related activities. If these be the nature of the changes—more of what we now have—we will be relying on a view of the past without a realistic view of the future.

The relatively young field of corrections in the United States—probation, institutions, and parole all included—has evolved a series of traditions which has become so institutionalized that it now takes the form of a correctional folklore or mythology.

I have traced elsewhere the history of the 50-unit concept for correctional workloads,[1] and while it is clear that this standard emerged almost 50 years ago, it has not yet been subjected to rigid scrutiny. Yet, the concept is firmly entrenched in our thinking; budgets for operating agencies, testimony before governmental bodies, standards for practice, and projections for future operational needs all center about the number "50." And it must be emphasized that there is no empirical justification for this or, for that matter, any other number—including the recent "35" recommended by the President's Crime Commission.

---

[1] Robert M. Carter and Leslie T. Wilkins, "Some Factors in Sentencing," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 58 (1967).

Tradition also dictates the design and utilization of the presentence report process in our courts. A recently prepared and sophisticated guide to the preparation of presentence reports by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts[2] is but the latest evolutionary formulation emerging from a concept which dates back to the 1910 efforts of William Healy.[3] The primary purpose of the presentence report is to aid the decision-makers in the judicial and correctional process by providing data on the character and personality of the offender, "to offer insight into his problems and needs, to help understand the world in which he lives, to learn about his relationships with people, and to discover those salient factors that underlie his specific offense and conduct in general."[4] The report has many uses: to assist the court in imposing a judgment consistent with its dual responsibility to society and the defendant, to aid the probation officer in his rehabilitative efforts during the period of supervision, to enable institutional personnel to better plan and implement classification, treatment, and prerelease programs, to provide relevant data to paroling authorities during their deliberation, and to enable parole officers to better utilize the period of conditional freedom of the offender for re-entry into society.

Usage of the presentence report is now so widespread and its importance so well recognized that little attention is focused upon its latent aspects. The report has become a normal, almost routine part of the processing of offenders, and as such, is almost free from scrutiny. Perhaps the only conflict remaining is the issue of confidentiality and this relates more to the rights and protection of offenders than to the document itself.

---

[2] Division of Probation, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, *The Presentence Investigation Report* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965).

[3] William Healy, "The Individual Study of the Young Criminal," *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology,* 1 (May 1910)

[4] Division of Probation, *The Presentence...,* p. 1.

Recent evidence suggests, however, that the presentence process should be examined in depth with primary attention directed toward the relevance of certain data for decision-making by those engaged in the administration of justice and corrections. This "relevance of data" is critical. In view of the very narrow range of alternatives available to the decision-makers, it appears that our current information-collection effort is far ahead of the options we have to utilize the information. Courts generally have three sentencing alternatives (decisions) available—probation, jail, or imprisonment. Without commentary on the inadequacy of probation as frequently practiced, the ineptness of jails in achieving stated correctional goals, or the fact that prisons produce as much criminality as they prevent, the selection of available alternatives can be made with far less information than is currently collected.

The same is true for probation officer decision-making. Large, undifferentiated caseloads and few courses of action available relating to treatment render detailed data on offenders almost irrelevant. Institution staff, limited in number and handicapped by an absence of realistic rehabilitation programs and financial resources, have only a minor range of options. A paroling authority with two alternatives, to grant or deny parole, hardly needs or benefits from sophisticated data, particularly when even this dichotomous decision is complicated, if not determined, by bed-space considerations.

In short, when viewing the very limited number of decisions available, our requirements for information are slight, at least in comparison to the data needed to select the best from a dozen alternatives. This suggests that while every effort should be made to obtain legislative enactments which will provide more flexibility and greater room for maneuver, we might profitably amend some of our current information gathering processes. The presentence report, as an example, could readily be revised so that only the most significant data are collected. Indeed, the Task Force Report on Corrections, recently prepared by the President's Crime Commission, observed that experimentation with new and simpler forms of presentence investigation is important because presentence reports frequently include materials "of doubtful relevance to disposition." Such experimentation might well focus on including data of a "need to know" variety and excluding "nice to know" information seemingly unrelated to decision-making.

Our supervision heritage also may be examined. The tradition is one-to-one, face-to-face, all-purpose, individual counseling by a probation or parole officer who, in theory but not in fact, is all things to all men under all circumstances. In my judgment, "all-purpose" probation and parole officers are fiction, not fact. Indeed, effective supervision may better be housed within a "specific" rather than a "generality" framework, although this opens the Pandora's Box of confrontation of generalist versus specialist. There may be a need for the development of a new role for the probation and parole officer other than the one he has normally fulfilled. The proposed role might realistically be one of a catalyst between the offender and his community: a role in which the probation and parole officer seeks to activate the community to absorb the offender as a member of that community. Ultimately it must be the community, not corrections, which is the strength of the offender. An attempt needs to be made to reduce the alienation of the offender from his community and to impair the continuing maintenance of a criminal identity: both of these processes are the antithesis of community adjustment. For example, the suggested role of the probation and parole officer would no longer be to find employment for the offender, but instead to direct him into the normal channels of job-seeking in the community. If the offender is having residential, financial, or marital difficulties, the officer would do well to assist the offender to engage those community resources which deal with these problem areas. Again, the purpose must be to ensure a process of community, not correctional, absorption. Probation and parole officers who continue the traditional supervision practices of problem-solving for those under supervision are ensuring a dependency relationship which ultimately denies the offender successful membership in his community.

In short, I would suggest more than an extension of the use of community resources. Identifying the offender as an offender, referring him as an offender to community agencies which, in turn, provide services because he is an offender, does little to destroy the albatross of a criminal label. Indeed, such usage of community resources serves only to perpetuate the maintenance of a criminal identity. It is suggested that deliberate efforts be made at the earliest possible moment to sever the umbilical cord which links the offender to the correctional agency. At the very minimum there should be an attempt to reduce the offender's dependence upon the correctional system and its representatives.

There are offenders in the correctional population who, in my judgment, will succeed regardless of the presence or absence of treatment programs. Sadly, there are offenders who will fail regardless of efforts of treators and treatment programs as currently constituted. But there is a group of offenders who may succeed or fail depending upon our efforts and programs—and it is this population which needs our attention.

Can we definitely determine these typologies and develop meaningful programs for addressing the needs of each? Recent research data suggest that the identification part of our complex problem can rather readily be accomplished, although the programmatic aspects are not so easily ascertained. And finally, there is danger in our constant attention to the offender as the sole focus—the single variable—in corrections. It is fraudulent (but probably self-protective) to assume the offender as ***the variable*** and all else as the constant. There are variations in probation and parole officers, in probation and parole agencies, in probation and parole agency social systems, and in probation and parole agency treatment programs—which must be examined concurrently with the attention directed towards the offender.

Finally, in examining our traditions, we must ask if what we are doing is relevant to the real world. Can a probation/parole officer—in 30 minutes a month—or can any educational or training program within an institution compensate for the not uncommon young offender who suffers the disadvantageousness associated with minority group status, subsistence at the poverty level, inadequate educational or vocational skills and competences, residence in the ghetto with its feelings of hopelessness, boredom, and repression, delinquent peers, associates, and neighborhoods, the broken home syndrome and the welfare cycle, and the complexities of living with a set of values different from those upon which the law is based ? Singly or in combination, these and other factors suggest that our "50-minute hour" efforts are irrelevant in the real world.

What is the central theme of these comments ? Simply, we in corrections tend to rely on tradition—particularly when confronted with difficult new problems or new dimensions of old problems. We find comfort and sanctity in established models, but we cannot always find appropriate guides for the future in those models. Innovation, creativity, and imagination are not part of our heritage, and complete dependence upon that heritage is not likely to insure that corrections keep pace with the enormous political and social changes in our society. It is appropriate to review our correctional past and note the progress which has taken place, but there is a desperate need to review what we have done and its relevance to what we must yet do.

JOHN J. GALVIN
JOINT COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND TRAINING

Dr. Sullivan's thoughtful and thought-provoking paper suggests several possible directions we might go in improving the correctional institution's capacity to deal with the question of the offender's vocational competence.

On the one hand, it is important to recognize that institutional programs at their best only make a contribution to the task of offender rehabilitation. Institutions cannot help being, in some measure, hot houses whose products are not conditioned to either the demands or opportunities of life in normal communities; provisions must be made to prepare the community and to follow-up the offender when he returns to it.

Something of the nature of the community's role in offender restoration is relfected in an article by Staff Reporter Richard D. James in the May 21, 1968, issue of *The Wall Street Journal*. This describes the experiences of a General Electric plant in Chicago in seeking to utilize a new kind of manpower—poorly educated, unskilled, impoverished ghetto residents, mostly Negro. The innovation required significant changes in recruitment standards, drastic reorientation of supervisors and managers toward the level of patience and persistence demanded, development of special orientation and training programs for these new workers, special care in quality control to prevent distribution of sub-par products, and, over-all, sizable additional costs.

Employers who will take on those offenders who are least oriented to the world of work cannot be sold a bill of goods. They must make a commitment to a difficult and often thankless task. Corrections people must discover ways of motivating them to do so and be prepared to suggest means they might employ in carrying out their commitment. This is a central task of corrections which has been largely neglected and indeed, in the past, little recognized.

A young attorney with little knowledge of correctional history and traditions recently suggested to me that perhaps we should seek to persuade employers to move into the prison—train the inmates realistically, operate prison industries where they can gain practical experience, and then, in effect, feed well-prepared prisoner-graduates into their plants, offices, warehouses, and so on in the community. The memory of the evils of the contract labor system in the state prisons of this country is too strong and bitter for this suggestion to evoke enthusiasm from veteran correctional people. At the same time the idea threatens vested interests which have a stake in existing production and service programs carried on by state prisoners. Difficult legislative changes would be required in the face of probable opposition not only from these groups but from organized labor, segments of the business community, and others.

Nevertheless, somehow, community employers and confined offenders must be brought together in ways that will lead to eventual integration. Work release and training furloughs are already available in many jurisdictions, and the number of these is increasing monthly. These arrangements are fine for offenders seen as ready for such a degree of freedom, especially where they are confined in or near their home communities.

But we cannot wait until a man is eligible and ready for this step. We need to be working with him when security requirements or geographical factors rule out his placement in community work or training programs. And even if we reject any notion of reviving the old contract system in some new and constructive form, we can still bring the industrial community inside in other ways. At the Urban Job Corps Center in San Marcos, Texas, a committee of business leaders has assumed responsibility not only for generally advising center personnel as to kinds and methods of training but for donating services of technical staff for realistic consultation. They have also donated good, up-to-date equipment. Very importantly, they have organized a placement service for center graduates and committed themselves to go out of their way in assuring that they have appropriate job and career opportunities.

We have had some of this sort of thing in corrections—but not nearly enough. Nor have our prison industries people always maintained the kind of identity with the business world that they might. Products, equipment, methods, quality control, marketing practices, accounting, manpower use and training—all these and other operations will obsolesce quickly today, if the prison wall separates industries' managers and foremen from their counterparts in private enterprise.

Perhaps the greatest weakness in our prison work programs is their failure to be sufficiently demanding and challenging. Common conditions include: short hours and frequent excused absences for all sorts of activities which community people take care of in free time; weak quality control and failure to insist on good workmanship; slow or unsteady pace of work; and all sorts of utilization problems because of fear of connivery, manipulation, escape attempts, or other abuses by the inmate workers. Central to these conditions, in my opinion, is our failure to compensate inmate workers at a level comparable to community wages, after deducting for costs of their care in confinement. If we paid people adequately—and with sufficient differential for different kinds, levels, and amounts of work—we could develop a realistic work program. We could teach the offender that work is activity with payoffs, not just as exercise in authoritarianism on the part of keepers.

JOHN McKEE
REHABILITATION RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Dr. Sullivan has always impressed me with his scholarship and insight into some of the very difficult problems of corrections. The paper that I am discussing now is a well-written and profound document on placement and employment problems of the public offender. I recommend its reading to every director of corrections and every state employment service person who is responsible for finding jobs for the public offender and providing follow-up services to him.

Dr. Sullivan remarks about the role of prison industries in corrections, noting that they have been used as an instrument of punishment and only recently as a means of training and possibly rehabilitation. Do not delude yourselves into thinking that core questions about prison industries will be solved in such meetings as these. These questions call for political-economic decisions on the part of directors of corrections in conference with labor, management, and public officials, such as governors and state legislators. People like us—the educators, the behavioral scientists—have the role of asking proper and honest questions about the functions of prison industries in an educational and rehabilitation program. If we are asked to participate in evaluating prison industries or in working out educational programs which will take advantage of an industry to train a number of inmates, we have an obligation to determine just how these industries relate to the correctional objectives of the institution. Some large prison industries, such as farming, have very doubtful correctional value. Their chief purpose is to keep otherwise idle hands busy, tie up energies that correctional authorities are afraid would cause trouble, and to appease the court's and public's demand for "hard labor." Such industries are actually a part of the custodial and behavioral control program, not of behavior modification. It is conceivable that they could have some modification value, but that is not their intent at the present time.

More germane is the role of work in the lives of prisoners. Work has no correctional value (except perhaps for suppression of undesirable behaviors) unless it prepares a prisoner for effective and independent living in free society. Correctional officials sometimes abuse the whole concept of work by reinforcing the politicians' request that the prisoner be totally self-supporting and that work be a means of punishment. Some correctional officials actually boast about their institution's being self-supporting, about the products that they produce, and about the heavy work load that is required of prisoners in their charge. Such a "correctional" attitude supports the notion that prisons exist for the convenience and creature comforts of the staff. Modern penology and humanitarian concepts demand that the offender undergo a program of behavior modification in which he receives training in human development and social restoration. These are the basic goals of corrections—all others should be subordinate to them.

Dr. Sullivan mentions that we are frequently caught in the trap of doing things *to* and *for* prisoners: we diagnose and prescribe and we institute and carry out a behavior modification program—as if inmates were *things* to manipulate. I am not opposed to diagnosis and prescription (and I do not think Dr. Sullivan is), if we bring the inmate into the whole process and share with him our objectives and get his agreement on a program of change. By doing this, we become less manipulative and perhaps more effective in bringing about the goal that is the heart of the correctional process.

Dr. Sullivan describes types of jobs and training, barriers to employment, etc., for the ex-offender. My feeling is that every job that an ex-offender has in free society should have a career ladder built into it with a follow-up program of training and work enhancement. And the job should be prestigious. Dr. Charles Slack, in working with street-corner gangs long ago, pointed out the importance of prestige and status and that a job for the ex-offender should give him a sense of importance, not only in terms of title but also in terms of his actual job performance. The menial job for the chronic offender will, therefore, not compensate, will not bring about the kinds of work attitudes, enthusiasm, commitment, and work-role functioning that are essential for the offender to be successful in free society.

Barriers to employment for offenders should be removed. Artificial barriers, such as requiring bonding (and no bonding company will bond an ex-offender), have been attacked by the federal government. A bonding program has been underwritten by the Department of Labor, and the program has demonstrated that bonding is frequently not essential to being employed.

Other barriers, such as the GED Tests, statutory requirements, and licensing laws that ban offenders from jobs, should be eliminated if we are to take the offender into full citizen participation.

For the past few years there has been a very high level of employment, which may be the chief contributor to the rehabilitation of the public offender. It makes possible—even facilitates—the rehabilitation of the public offender by insuring his employment. There have been times when few jobs were available, resulting in the ex-offender's reverting to a life of crime to support himself and his family.

I think Dr. Sullivan could have expanded a bit on the description of some of the transitional problems the ex-offender would encounter and how to organize community resources to focus them on various crisis points of the offender's daily adjustment. The ex-offender experiences many transitional problems from prison to free community, such as fear of an uncertain and strange world, knowing how to manage his money, working steadily day in and day out, managing his leisure time in such a way as not to endanger his freedom. It seems to me that this paper could be strengthened by pointing out when transitional problems are acute enough to need attention—how much, by whom, and what kind? More needs to be said about transitional programs that support graduated release, such as work-release, halfway houses, sheltered training and sheltered work experience.

Some of the problems Dr. Sullivan described are related to the marked dependence some ex-offenders have upon those free people in the correctional institution who were very significant to him. I believe it would be a mistake to cut arbitrarily the umbilical cord immediately upon release. Independent behavior needs to be shaped, and this shaping process should begin in the institution, gradually approximating full independence by the time the offender is released. But the process in many cases is not complete by the time of release. Many experiences will be new to him—holding a skilled job and working a full day, handling authority better, using his leisure time differently, etc. The ex-offender still needs an anchor, a crutch from significant others, until such a time as he can begin achieving positive reinforcers in the free community. So, it may be helpful to extend the correctional institution into the community until the ex-offender is stronger.

Dr. Sullivan's paper is a fine treatise on the correctional process as it applies to the offender in transition from correctional institutions to free-world employment and participation. Its wisdom is derived from intensive study of the transitional process. I commend it to all correctional authorities to read and re-read.

Section III

Garland Wollard, Chairman

BANQUET ADDRESS

SANGER POWERS
WISCONSIN DIVISION OF CORRECTIONS

I am very pleased to see that the University of Wisconsin has taken an interest in correctional education. The University has been very closely identified with government in Wisconsin for many years, and we have come to rely on them to work hand-in-hand with us on many of the problems that we, in corrections, have.

I think that in relating education to the field of corrections we should keep a few points in mind. One of these is the people we are working with, involved with, and seeking to educate. The fact is that they are not just "cons"; they are not just numbers, as they are loosely referred to, but they are people—human beings—people in trouble with themselves and the world in which they live. All of them have been someone's boy or girl, brother or sister, father or mother. All of them have been, many still are, loved by someone. Many were trusted and respected in their homes and communities. Some never had that chance. Most of them were important in their own families. The great majority of them never stopped being Americans. The stereotype of the prisoner that the average citizen gains from radio, television, and movies is totally wrong. It is important that those of us working in the field, particularly those of you who are specifically concerned with education, not forget this.

I am reminded of the time when, after a very harrowing day as warden of the State Reformatory at Green Bay, the business manager called and said, "Sanger, the Governor's here, he wants to see you." He wanted to tour the institution. Afterwards, the Governor said, "I'm shocked. I don't know what I was looking for, but I wasn't looking for these kinds of faces. Really, this reminds me very much of the crew's mess on the battle ship on which I served in World War I." The only thing that *was* different was the kind of environment, the cultural and social background, from which these youths came. The difference was in the opportunities they had and the opportunities of the young men that Governor Kohler knew when he was on active duty in the Navy.

I think that it is important to keep in mind the fact that we are dealing with people—people who have probably the poorest self-image that one could expect to find, people who are normally lacking in self-confidence. They may have an air of bravado, of toughness, but really, this is masking an almost total lack of confidence in themselves. Most of these people with whom we deal and whom we seek to educate have incredibly poor concepts of self. I guess many of them could be said to have a failure syndrome—a long history of inadequacy and instability frequently resulting from extremely poor family and home relationships, including truancy from school, social and economic deprivation, and poor work records. As a result, many of these offenders have learned to accept a devalued self-image and feel totally unable to cope with their environment. They are so used to failure that they have learned to accept it.

Another thing about offenders that I have discovered is that they are about normal in terms of intelligence. At the time when we were still doing IQ tests at the reformatory, it seems to me that the records indicated that the average intelligence quotient was around 99 which is about normal. These are people who can be helped—if they can be reached. I think that in the light of these facts, one of the basic philosophical considerations must be that it is important to work for the development of an improved self-concept for an offender—to help him understand his own conflicts and defenses, to try to do something about his value system, to seek to replace an anti-social attitude with a pro-social attitude. It is important to concentrate on building rather than beating down self-respect if offenders are indeed to profit from programs in education and the services which are really intended to improve their chances of becoming useful citizens.

In a sense, the ultimate goal of a correctional institution is almost entirely to educate. Not the least important of this educational process, I feel, has to be that of social education—education for living—and it is important, therefore, that some time be spent on motivations, attitudes, and ethical and moral standards. Without this important concept of correctional treatment, academic education, vocational training, or related trades training may simply result in a prison being a finishing school, turning out more efficient burglars, more accomplished thieves, more talented con-men. The professional staff—the teachers, social workers, psychiatrists, and psychologists—have a very important role to play here, but so does everyone on an institutional staff. Education for living, I like to think, is everybody's job. For the precept and the example which are so important can be set or destroyed equally well by the foreman in the laundry or the correctional officer in the cell hall as by the teacher, the psychologist, or the social worker. I think there has to be a desire on the part of all the staff, particularly on the part of management, to make maximum use of treatment and rehabilitative services which are designed to restore people to useful living—calculated to restore or to instill, for the first time perhaps, self-respect, self-confidence, and respect for the rights of others. Little that is worthwhile will be accomplished if nothing is done about social attitudes and self-image and the self-respect of the offender.

Treatment or rehabilitative services obviously must be individualized, for each offender differs from all others in terms of his aptitudes, attitudes, emotional make-up, cultural or social background, and the home and community problems from which he comes and which he will face upon release. I think that the correctional process could be likened to a manufacturing process, which is a highly coordinated, scientific, computerized operation during which raw materials are subjected to various procedures, changes, processes—treatment, if you will—which takes place in certain places along the production line. In a production situation, all of the resources, activities, processes, tools, and personnel are mobilized and integrated to accomplish a desired end with the greatest speed and efficiency possible. In corrections, to draw an analogy, the offender is the raw material and he is subject to processing by law enforcement, prosecution, the judiciary, probation, highly diversified institutional services and programs, and parole services. The extent to which these services, facilities, and programs are integrated with the offender's rehabilitation as the desired end-result will determine their success or failure.

Just a word about treatment: I know that there are some people who say you should not use the word treatment, that this is a word reserved to medicine or psychology. But I remember hearing an interior decorator talk about the treatment on the walls, and an architect talk about the treatment of a facade of a building, so in terms of what we do with offenders, we can appropriately use the word "treatment." I think we can look at it in a narrow or a broad sense. I prefer to look at treatment in its broad sense, as involving everything that is done to, for, or with an offender who is under supervision, either within or without an institution by whomever he comes in contact with. I think such treatment can be sound and purposeful or it can be shoddy and purposeless. It can consist of either a host of unrelated, uncoordinated exposures to staff members who have differing philosophies, or as a desirable alternative, a team approach to the problems of an offender by a staff working in concert and dedicated to the proposition that offenders are people who can be helped to change.

Perhaps, at this point, I might appropriately note the importance of genuine concern on the part of all staff for the welfare and well-being of the youthful and adult offenders who are found in institutions. I think that the staff member with honest concern, dedication, and an empathetic interest in the offenders with whom he works must have the following attributes: first, the love of his fellow man; second, the capacity to love people he does not like or whose actions he does not approve; third, a belief in the God-given worth and dignity of the individual and in the capacity of people to change; fourth the willingness to put up with, indeed, understand and accept, the difficult offender in the certain knowledge that he can be helped if he can be reached; and, fifth, a genuine interest, an honest and sympathetic interest, in helping another, less fortunate than he, along with the delight that ought to come from seeing young people learn and grow. These, I think, are the basic concerns that are prerequisites to success in working with offenders. The correctional officer, the youth counselor, the cook, and the maintenance man with these kinds of honest concerns will unquestionably have a greater impact for good on young people or older offenders than the teacher, social worker, or psychiatrist who is devoid of all but a sterile and professional interest in his client.

When I was made warden of the reformatory in 1951, I remember receiving a request from a prisoner who wanted to see me. We had been making a number of changes in the institution after I got there. One of the things I was expected to do was to turn the place upside-down and substitute a treatment-oriented program for a highly rigid, punitive, custodially-oriented program. As I had no prior institutional experience, I did not realize that this could not be done; so we made a lot of changes. We had little trouble with the prisoners; our troubles were with the staff who for the first time had to learn to think with their heads instead of just using their hands. The things we did were relatively simple, like letting an inmate write to someone other than father, mother, brother, sister, wife, or child and to be able to write every-day, or letting people talk across the table while they ate instead of the silent system.

At any rate this prisoner came in to see me. He said,

> You know, I just thought I ought to tell you, that this new program that you are putting in is for the birds. These young punks that are coming in today, they don't realize how good they got it. I been around here a long time; I appreciate it, but these young punks, they don't appreciate it. They don't know how well off they are.

Well, we did not agree on anything, he sold me nothing, and I am confident I did not sell him anything. A year later he came back to see me; he was leaving at this time. He said,

> I've had another year here, and a chance to think about what we talked about, and I have now decided that you were right and I was wrong. I have left here three times before, but this is the first time I'm going out without a chip on my shoulder. Every other time I've been so mad at what happened to me here that I could hardly wait to get out to get even. As a result I got in trouble.

He did not come back. Moreover, I still hear from him. I like to think that what spelled the difference for him was the fact that for the first time he found people interested in him as a man in trouble and interested in helping him to help himself. This is why I think that it is so important that we have an honest, genuine, empathetic concern with people. If we do not have it, I do not think we are going to make any progress in terms of educating or changing people who have trouble with the world in which they live.

I have been alluding to the importance of looking at the kinds of people we seek to educate and our attitudes about them. This is nothing new; this is not original with me. Back in 1930, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was Governor of New York, he appointed a commission which came to be known as the Lewisohn Commission to study certain phases of New York's penal system. (I might add that there is a study under way right now, in which I am participating, of New York's penal system.) They did a very careful investigation and reported to the Governor, and among their findings I found this statement:

> The need for better training is greater today than ever before. An increasingly large percentage of the inmates of our correctional institutions are comparatively young men and women who are more receptive to training than those of the older group. The ability of the institutions to provide training adapted to meet their needs will determine whether they are returned to society better prepared to earn a living and to become self-supporting people and self-respecting members of society. The primary purpose of our correctional institutions is to take an anti-social group of underprivileged, undereducated, and vocationally untrained men and women and prepare them better to meet the responsibilities of social and economic citizenship.

Thirty-seven years later, the President's Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, among other things, stated:

> Getting a job is harder than it used to be for people without preparation. Poorly educated untrained youth, from 16-21 years of age, are becoming the nation's most stubborn employment problem. Our current economy simply does not need the skills and attributes they have to offer.

This is, in a sense, the same story, the same picture, and the same people about whom the same concern was expressed.

I think that while there may be a need today to be innovative, there is an even greater need to apply more of what we already know about meeting the special problems presented by rehabilitation of offenders, particularly youthful offenders. One of our problems is the failure to fully use and exploit all that is known to be effective in dealing with people with problems. One of the reasons for this is the institutionalization, not only of offenders, but of staff and attitudes—a tendency to be "gobbled-up" by the traditions and the precedents of the past.

Perhaps I might tell you about Wisconsin. In doing so, I am mindful of the story that is told about the Kentucky mountaineer. This fellow lived way back in the brush country of Kentucky, up in the mountains. He knew nothing that was modern. One day he strayed a little farther than usual from his home, and came upon a campfire. The fire was out; he kicked into the fire with his foot and turned up something bright. It was a broken mirror. He knew so little about modern things that he had never seen a mirror before. He picked it up and looked at it and said, "Well, if it ain't old Pa. I never knew that Pa had his picture took." So he put it in his pocket and went home for lunch, then sneaked up to the garret, hid the picture of "old Pa" because his wife was not especially high on old Pa and he didn't want her to have it or see it. As soon as he left, his wife went upstairs and hunted around to see what he had been doing up there and what he might have hidden. She ran across this piece of mirror. She looked at it and said, "So that's the old bag he's been chasing around with." So in telling you about Wisconsin, I am mindful of the fact that I see what I want to see.

I guess in order to place what I may say in some measure of perspective, I ought to tell you a little bit about our Wisconsin correctional organization. I think that this state is rather unique in this country, in the sense that the Division of Corrections is in a state department of health and social services. We are the largest agency in the state, with more than 90,000 employees. But the significant thing is that in Wisconsin, corrections is regarded as a part of the public welfare, health, and social services problem. Corrections is one of seven divisions of the Department of Health and Social Services—the others are Health, Mental Hygiene, Child Welfare, Public Assistance, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Management Services. The Division of Corrections has the responsibility for operating all of the correctional activities in which the state has a financial interest. We are charged with operating the institutions for juvenile delinquents, the institutions for adult offenders, a state-wide probation service, and a state-wide parole system (the members of the parole board are a part of the staff)—in other words, it is a completely integrated, single ball of wax. Everything that is labelled corrections that the state has a responsibility for is lodged in a single agency, and this has, for Wisconsin at least, been successful.

Within the Division of Corrections we have five bureaus—Management Services, Institutional Services, Probation and Parole Services, Clinical Services, and Research and Evaluation. Within the Bureau of Institutions, as Mr. Wollard indicated, we have a Superintendent of Correctional Education. Each of our seven major institutions (in the major institutions I do not count the correctional camp system which is a prison in the aggregate and at present includes about 400 offenders) has a school principal and a full complement of paid teaching personnel, both academic and vocational. All of these teachers, and their number is in excess of 200, are either licensed or certified by the State Department of Public Instruction or the State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education. They possess the same qualifications as those required for employment in the public schools in Wisconsin. A week or two ago, in looking through some of the material prepared by the Task Force on Corrections for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Crime, I read the section dealing with education and I found reference to the fact that in most penal institutions in this country the teaching is done by inmates. The article went on to say that two of the notable exceptions are New York and California. I just want you to know that in the last 15 years in Wisconsin, you could not find a prisoner teaching other prisoners. We feel that an inmate teacher cannot possibly supply the motivation, set the kind of example, or provide the sort of image which is necessary if education is to be meaningful. Very frankly, I guess that I resent the omission of Wisconsin as an exception in the report.

All of the teaching that is done in Wisconsin institutions is done by a paid staff. If you want to roughly divide 200 teachers by the seven institutions you will discover that this averages about 30 teachers per institution; actually the reformatory, which has a population of approximately 700, has something like 36 full-time, paid teachers. The Wisconsin Home for Women, which has a population today of about 100, has 15 full-time teachers with some part-time help. The typical boys' school, such as Kettle Moraine, with a capacity of 284 has 28 full-time, paid teachers. We have felt that if you believe in education you ought to believe in doing it right. You should use the kind of teachers that they use outside. You should have enough of them so that classes can be small enough to do the kind of job that needs to be done. One of the first steps that we have taken here is that of insuring that our teaching is realistic. For one thing our classes are substantially smaller than you would find in the public schools of Wisconsin. The maximum class size is 15 students; many of them have only six or seven. We have a lot of remedial work going on, both on an individual and on a group basis. Almost all of our offenders come to us substantially educationally retarded. Therefore, one of our goals must be to bring the underachieving student or inmate up to a level where he can hope to achieve with his peers when he returns to his home community. We have spent a lot of time on remedial training and teaching in small classes.

We have had faculty meetings to discuss the use of such devices as problem-solving and role-playing to get at the special problems of the offender. In this endeavor, we have used the faculty of the Wisconsin State University at Oshkosh, the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee, and other Wisconsin state universities. We have devised a project which bears the rather euphemistic title of "Unicor"—which signifies a joint university and corrections effort for improvement of teachers concerned with educating disadvantaged youths and adults in Wisconsin correctional institutions. The basic purpose of this program is to improve the ability of the elementary and secondary school teachers and the vocational instructors in working with the educationally disadvantaged youth; and second, in increasing the degree of cooperation and communication between correctional and public school educators. Additionally, all of our teachers have summer leave at least once in three years when they are expected to go back to summer school and work on a Master's degree if they do not have one.

Perhaps at this point I might appropriately relate an anecdote about one of our inmates. Two years ago I was visiting the reformatory with our supervisor of security problems, Ray Stoffel. As we were walking around the yard, a bright looking young Negro lad came up. He had some books under his arm and he wanted Stoffel to know that he was just finishing high school. This young man had had a terribly deprived, disadvantaged background. He did not know his mother or his father, had been kicked around from family to family, ended up in an orphanage, skipped out of there, landed in some institution for dependent children in the South, left there, wound up in New Jersey in a training school, escaped, and came to Wisconsin. He was apprehended in Milwaukee after commiting an armed robbery. We got him for a relatively long sentence at the prison. He was very frank about telling us where he had been, so we wrote, as I am sure all of you do, to these other institutions to find out what we had. From both institutions, we learned that this was a mentally defective, or border-line mental-defective, Negro youngster, highly dangerous, with no capacity to absorb any education. In the interim, however, we had done our own testing. We discovered that this was not quite true. We felt that this boy had the capacity to learn. He was given intensive, individual remedial help at the prison, to the point where he was ready for high school. At this point, he was transferred to the reformatory where the emphasis is more on education than in the prison, and he finished high school at the reformatory. It turned out that this youngster had an IQ of about 130. After he graduated from high school, he went from the reformatory to our medium security prison at Fox Lake, and he is out on parole now. I believe this fall he will enter the University. This was a border-line mentally defective boy! We could have accepted him for what he seemed to be, but we worked with him instead. I guess what I am trying to say is that it is important to know who you are working with, and what their capacities are, and to have the kind of people on your staff who are willing to take the time that is necessary to bring out in people what is really within them. Incidently, we have a Jaycee chapter at the institution in Fox Lake. I think that there are Jaycee chapters at other correctional institutions in this country, but we have a very active one there. This boy was president last year. Some such highly motivated offenders may be people we ought to look at as potential employees in the field. They have been through it; they certainly have the interest; they have the dedication. They may very well have something to contribute to others. I do not fully embrace the "new careers" idea, but I think that there may be something here with respect to selected offenders.

I would like to mention one of the rather interesting experiments we have been conducting recently. In northern Wisconsin, midway between Tony and Ladysmith, we have been operating Camp Flambeau as a forestry camp for adult offenders. A year ago, we decided that we would convert this facility into a camp for juveniles. We moved all of the adults into another forestry camp; we left about 10 behind to keep up with the food preparation, the dishwashing, and this sort of thing, and we moved in 40 young people, screened from the populations of the boys' schools. These were youngsters who, if they had stayed behind at these training schools, would probably have spent about three months at the schools. When we selected them to go to this camp, we told them that they would probably spend about six months there, because our plan for the youngsters was that they enroll in the local high schools for a minimum of one semester. We sent 40 boys there; we had 20 in the high school at Ladysmith and 20 in the high school at Tony. We had worked this all out very carefully, with the school boards, the school district, and the high schools. They were very willing to accept these youngsters. I think one of the prime advantages for the boys was that they had the opportunity of going to a school where they would associate with a nondelinquent peer group. In our normal training school situation, they go to school only with other delinquents. We had a lot of help from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (Voc-Rehab), which provided the funds to permit, at each of these schools, the employment of an additional guidance counselor, an additional vocational education teacher, and part-time secretarial help, and to finance some added equipment in the vocational shops. Voc-Rehab also provided the money necessary to bus these youngsters back and forth to school; they also had to be bussed or taken by station wagon to extracurricular activities. We expected them to participate fully in all extracurricular activities. We provided the quarters, the supervision, the lodging, and the food during out-of-school hours at Camp Flambeau. The Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Association declared each boy eligible for interscholastic athletics on a day-to-day basis, which permitted them to compete immediately upon arrival, waiving the usual eligibility rules.

We have had a year of experience with this project. We had 40 boys the first semester. The bulk of them went home, and we got another group of 40 in for the second semester. Of those who had been released, one asked if he could go into a foster home in the Ladysmith area so he could finish his senior year at Ladysmith High School; we arranged this for him. Another youth went home to live with an aunt; inside of a week the aunt called up and asked if he could come back. He came back and finished the year. We had several who got athletic letters; we had one boy on the student council; another one on the debate team; we had boys in football—as a matter of fact when we approached the school district to find out whether they would accept this project, they said, "Yes, provided you give us a few athletes."

I think that one of the important things was that for most of these boys this was the first time that they had acceptance, the opportunity to compete, and a chance of achieving—a chance of getting a letter, of making the debate team, or of being elected to the Student Council. Interestingly, at the time of the State Teacher's Convention, we let the whole crew go home on a four-day furlough. Despite the fact that they were scattered to the four corners of the state, every single youngster was back when the four days were over. I can tell you also that we had almost *no* discipline problem with the boys. They fit in very well, and this was a big advantage, as I see it, to the project. After they became acclimated to the Tony-Ladysmith (essentially rural) area, they were permitted to spend weekends in the homes of friends from school. In an article in the *Ladysmith News* of last year, one school official was quoted as saying, "You can't tell them from the other boys except that they are better behaved." I think that this has been a very rewarding experience. We think we see a chance here to avoid building further training schools. We think we see an opportunity to use community-centered, small facilities for at least some delinquent youth.

We have been doing another interesting thing at Black River Camp (this is another forestry camp except that this *was built* to house delinquent youth). Incidentally, all of our facilities in Wisconsin—the adult prisons, the reformatory, the Wisconsin Correctional Institution, the juvenile training schools—have single rooms or single cells. We have no doubles any place. In our new medium security prison and in the camps, people carry keys to their own rooms. At Black River Camp, we previously assigned the youngster who was past the mandatory school age of 18 to forestry projects, but we decided last fall that we would borrow from the experience of the CASE project at the National Training School for Boys in Washington. This is an operant-conditioning type of program, funded with an $85,000 per year grant under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act as a cooperative venture with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

When the boys are assigned to Black River, they start out with a stipend of 250 points—points being like money. From these points, they pay for such things as their private rooms, meals, recreational pursuits such as television, pool, ping pong, swimming, fishing, and items they might buy from the canteen. Through their participation and progress in a curriculum using programmed instruction, they are able to earn points to replenish their initial stipend. The boys work in small cubicles which we call "offices." They progress at their own rate of speed. For every page of work which a boy completes and for which he receives a grade of 85 or more, points are transferred to his bank account. The faster he works, the more points he earns. The more points he earns, the more he saves; the bigger his bank account becomes, the more he can spend. He can buy such things as a trip to a football game. If he uses up his stipend without having replenished it, he goes on relief or welfare; but I can tell you that the boys that go on relief do not stay there very long. We have discovered that the motivation to learn that is afforded by this kind of program is really astonishing. Many of the boys, at the time of their transfer home, are achieving at a level that no one would have believed possible when they arrived. Incidentally, any of the points that boys have accrued and not spent when they leave are converted into cash which they take with them.

I think another interesting approach which we have developed in the field of vocational education is that of small engine technician training. Here, through the use of an automated teaching system developed by the Ken Cook Company of Milwaukee, inmates at the Reformatory, Wisconsin Correctional Institution, and the Black River Camp are trained as small engine technicians. This teaching system incorporates teaching machines, audio visual training aids, engines, tools, workbooks, and a complete kit of accessories which are necessary to teach small engine overhaul and services. The program at the reformatory includes six individual work stations which are actually console units including a teaching machine with a television screen which tells the student exactly how to take apart and put together the engine, the tools, and the necessary equipment. Students here proceed at their own pace, just like the operant-conditioning program I mentioned earlier. After approximately 126 hours of this type of instruction, students are brought to the level of proficiency necessary to secure employment in the field. Interestingly, quite a few members of our staff, as well as people in the area who have heard about this program, have asked if they could take it.

We are using audio-visual programming to develop a program for the teaching of basic reading skills. One of our staff has been sent to the Ken Cook Company to develop a custom program for the student who is substantially retarded in reading skills. With a very simple machine (the same kind we use for the small engine repair course) the student can set his own pace, permitting him to be brought up to a level of achievement where he can read and thus compete more successfully.

I should conclude this and in doing so I would like to go back to what I said earlier. I do not think that we need to know more than we do now; I think we have to be motivated to want to use what we know, to try to do the kind of job that ought to be done because poor corrections is the most expensive brand. In essence it seems to me that we are confronted with a problem which calls for a lot more than a comfortable reaffirmation of faith, something more than lip service to the concepts of correction. If we are to meet our great responsibilities, we must roll up our sleeves and get to work, for surely we have the tools to do the job.

Edmund Burke, the Irish philosopher once said, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." Good men in corrections interested in helping others less fortunate than they need be limited in their accomplishments only by the firmness of their faith, the courage of their convictions, and the contagion of their enthusiasm.

Section IV

Marshall Colston, Chairman

EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS OF RELEASED PRISONERS: DIMENSIONS AND SOCIOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

GEORGE A. POWNALL
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

For over a century, poverty, deprivation, unemployment, and idleness have been cited as explanations for crime and delinquency. Numerous studies attempting to show these relationships have been conducted. In 1937, Thorsten Sellin, summarizing and appraising studies of this type, pointed out that their methods have seldom been carefully developed and their indexes of both crime and business conditions have varied.[1] Thus, he contends that no positive and valid generalizations of the relationship between crime and poverty can be made.

The questions related to this study are as follows:

1. Is there a relationship between poverty and crime ?
2. Is unemployment related to crime ?
3. Can job training during imprisonment and job placement afterwards reduce unemployment and thereby decrease recidivism ?

Certainly some poor people commit crime, but others do not. Some people who are unemployed commit crime, but others do not. Some wealthy people commit crime, regardless of their employment status.

Past Studies

While these statements may seem to be confusing, some studies made since Sellin's appraisal have provided more conclusive evidence of a strong relationship between crime rates and unemployment. Glaser and Rice, in analyzing officially reported cases, found evidence that crime rates vary directly with unemployment.[2] Property crimes by adults increased sharply with unemployment and decreased sharply with full employment. However, crimes by juveniles decreased slightly with unemployment. In an extensive study, Belton Fleisher reanalyzed some of the national data used by Glaser and Rice,[3] and using complex mathematical procedures to make corrections for long-run trends in the variables studied, he confirmed the Glaser-Rice findings of a positive relationship between arrest rates as indicative of crime rates and unemployment. However, he concluded that the relationship is significant for property crimes and *all* age groups. Since for all age groups property crimes are second only to offenses against public order and morality in arrest statistics, the Glaser-Rice and Fleisher conclusions seem to be consistent with what would be expected.[4]

---

[1] Thorsten Sellin, *Research Memorandum on Crime in the Depression* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1937). For another discussion of crime and economic conditions see: W.A. Bonger, *Criminality and Economic Condition* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1966); and George B. Vold, *Theoretical Criminology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. 177-81.

Further, the United States official statistics indicate that the largest proportion of delinquent and criminal behavior is found among the working class.[5] The degree of over-representation of working-class persons in the criminal population varies under different socioeconomic conditions. While in some instances working-class people may have crime rates lower than other classes, most studies show that high proportions of working-class law violators have engaged in crimes against property.[6]

Persons in the lower socioeconomic classes are likely to have more frequent contact with criminal or antisocial individuals or groups than are members of middle or upper classes, enhancing the probability that these individuals, when unemployed, will become involved in criminal behavior. While employment on a legitimate job does not eliminate the same possibility, it significantly decreases its likelihood. Glaser, in his studies on unemployment and crime, points out that:

---

[2] Daniel Glaser and Kent Rice, "Crime, Age, and Unemployment," *American Sociological Review* 24 (October, 1959), pp. 679-86. See also: Daniel Glaser, *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System* (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1964), p. 9.

[3] Belton M. Fleisher, "The Effect of Unemployment on Delinquent Behavior," *Journal of Political Economics*, 71 (1963), pp. 543-55; and Belton M. Fleisher, *The Economics of Delinquency* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1966).

[4] *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States* (Washington: U. S. Department of Justice, 1965), Table 19.

[5] E. H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, *Principles of Criminology* (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1966), pp. 235-38.

[6] *Ibid.*

> Obviously recidivism, and to some extent other social conditions, may be causes of unemployment, rather than consequences. However, it seems reasonable to infer that employment was usually a major factor making possible an integrated "style of life" which included non-recidivism, successful marriage, and satisfaction in other social relationships.[7]

He suggests that employment is not only a major factor in enhancing the possibility of released prisoners making a successful life adjustment in aspects of life other than economic, but that the failure to obtain or maintain employment might enhance significantly their chances of returning to crime.

This was supported by a recent study in Wisconsin on factors related to success of those on parole.[8] The Wisconsin study found that parolees with improved employment over their job experience six months prior to commitment had lower rates of parole violation than those who did not work or worked sporadically. This suggests that stability in employment contributed greatly to nonrecidivism. While other studies have shown that precommitment unemployment is one of the best predictors of parole failure, this negative factor can be reduced when the offender is made more employable. Further evidence of the impact of employment is shown in a study of parolee earnings in Virginia over a 12-year period.[9] It was found that the rate of parole violation was inversely related to monthly earnings.

---

[7] Glaser, *The Effectiveness of...,* p. 7.

[8] Dean Babst and James E. Cowden, ***Program Research in Correctional Effectiveness***, Report #1 (Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Public Welfare, Division of Research, 1967).

[9] John M. Martin, "Lower Class Delinquency and Work Programs," ***Work, Youth, and Unemployment,*** eds. Melvin Herman, Stanley Sadofsky, and Bernard Rosenberg (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968), p. 443 quoting Bureau of Public Administration, ***The Virginia Parole System—An Appraisal of Its First Twelve Years*** (Charlottesville: University of Virginia, May, 1955), p. 106.

These studies have emphasized that the success of offenders released from institutions may be, to a large extent, dependent upon their success in the area of employment. However, the knowledge we have about the released prisoner's experiences during the post-release period is extremely limited. Also, there is very little precise information concerning the extent of unemployment among released prisoners. Most available information has been provided on a state or regional basis and has come primarily from the state of California.[10] Certainly there is a need for more complete information which would provide a sound basis for national programs and policies to deal effectively with the problem.

The growing unrest among the lower socioeconomic classes and a growing concern over the seriousness of the crime problem resulted in the government's "War on Poverty" which has included the development and expansion of programs in the area of corrections.[11] These poverty programs have been developed within the framework of opportunity theory.[12] While opportunity theory has been developed in terms broader than purely economic opportunity, it has been convenient for those concerned with the task of solving the problems to formulate their programs in terms of economic opportunities.

The model employed by these programs (see Figure A) has been based on the assumption that improved vocational and educational training should open new employment opportunities for persons in the

---

[10] For examples see: Selden Menefee, *Employment Trends Among California Youth Authority Wards on Parole*, Research Report 34 (Sacramento: California Youth Authority, January 16, 1963) and Joachim P. Seckel, *Employment and Employability Among California Youth Authority Wards: A Survey*, Research Report 30 (Sacramento: California Youth Authority, August 31, 1962).

[11] R. A. Nixon, "Federal Manpower Legislation (1961-66) with Special Reference to Youth," *Work, Youth, and Unemployment*, eds. Melvin Herman, Stanley Sadofsky, and Bernard Rosenberg (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968), pp. 94-110.

[12] For a discussion of opportunity theory, see Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, *Delinquency and Opportunity* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960).

FIGURE A

	Placement Assistance	No Placement Assistance
Skilled	Employed Employed	Employed Unemployed
Unskilled	Unemployed Employed	Unemployed Unemployed

lower socioeconomic classes. Job placement assistance and education should reduce unemployment and provide an improved standard of living for the lower socioeconomic classes. This improvement should result in a reduction of the crime rate.

This model is premised on the assumption that jobs are available. If jobs are scarce, employers can be selective and it becomes easier for them to discriminate against minority groups or persons with prison records even though these people possess the necessary skills. Certainly when there are jobs going unfilled, skill level rather than other attributes should be the major basis for employment.

THE STUDY

In the fall of 1965, a research contract was drawn between the University of Maryland and the Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, to undertake a study to provide information about the post-release employment experiences of former prisoners. The study consisted of three parts. The first was a national sample survey of 10 percent of all released federal prisoners who were under the supervision of the U.S. Board of Parole on June 30, 1964.[13] The final sample consisted of 945 cases. Data were collected on each of the cases from the files of the U.S. Board of Parole and the Federal Bureau of

---

[13] This date was selected because the U.S. Board of Parole had a tabulated listing of all men under supervision at that time. A similar listing for 1965 cases would not have been available until 1966, after the starting date of the project.

Prisons. Information was obtained on personal background and institutional experience, and some data were gathered on post-release experience as reported by the releasee.

The second part of the study was undertaken to supplement the national overview and to gain precise information about the experiences of released prisoners. All federal releasees who were under the parole or mandatory release supervision of the Philadelphia and Baltimore federal probation offices as of October 31, 1965, were interviewed.[14] This part of the study was called the "post-release survey" and consisted of 169 interviews, or 82 percent of all eligible releasees in that area. Most of those not interviewed had violated parole. The interviews provided the same basic information as the survey of records did for the national sample survey, except that much more detailed information was obtained on post-release experiences.

In the third part of the study, which was a panel design survey, all new releasees living in the Baltimore and Philadelphia metropolitan areas under the supervision of those cities' federal probation offices were interviewed.[15] The panel design involved initially interviewing upon release and then once a month for the first three months of the release period. The information obtained in this manner was the same as in the other two parts of the study, with the exception that the post-release information was more complete and probably more accurately reported since the interviews were being conducted as the men were actually undergoing the experiences about which they were being questioned. There were 54 cases eligible for panel interviews. Four cases violated parole before initial contact could be made; an additional 12 cases violated parole during the panel interviewing process; and 38 cases completed the panel sequence.

---

[14] Permission to interview federal parolees and mandatory releasees was granted by the U.S. Board of Parole and could not have been carried out without the full cooperation of the Division of Probation of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Chief Probation Officer Eugene DeCerbo and his staff, and Chief Probation Officer Burrell Kilmer and his staff.

[15] See Glaser, *The Effectiveness ...,* Appendix C. For a more detailed account of the panel technique, see Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet, *The People's Choice*, 1944. Also see Matilda W. Riley, *Sociological Research: Volume I, A Case Approach* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1963), pp. 555-68.

THE EXTENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF RELEASED PRISONERS[16]

A National Overview

Of the 945 cases included in the national sample of released federal prisoners, 892 were in the labor force as of June 30, 1964. Of the remaining 53 cases, 41 were not in the labor force (35 not being in the labor force during the whole month of June, and six leaving the labor force during the month); for 12 cases it was not possible to make an accurate estimate of their employment status on June 30. Of the former prisoners in the labor force, 83 percent were employed. Of those employed, 62.6 percent were employed full time. The employment status of males in the national civilian labor force at a comparable time was 95 percent, with 81 percent employed on full-time jobs. This comparison shows clearly that released prisoners have lower employment rates than males in the national civilian labor force. Further, of those parolees employed, a noticeably smaller proportion of them than of males in the national labor force were working on a full-time basis.

The post-release survey in Baltimore and Philadelphia supported these findings. Released federal prisoners under the supervision of these offices had much higher rates of unemployment on October 31, 1965, than did males in the national labor force in these two cities.

Age

Age was significantly related to employment status. The age rates consistently followed the same general pattern as the rates for the national civilian labor force. However, the released prisoner rates were significantly higher for each age category. Persons under 20 years of age had extreme difficulty in finding employment—35.8 percent or 1.6 times as great as the national population. Those 20-24 years old also had a high rate of unemployment—17.6 percent, which is twice as great as the national population. In the 25-34 age category the rate was 15.8 percent, or nearly five times as great. Those 35-44 had the lowest rate of unemployment (8.8 percent), but this was nearly four times as great as the rate for the national population. Those 45 or over had progressively increasing rates of unemployment, increasing in the

---

[16] Definitions used in this study approximate as nearly as possible the definitions used by the Department of Labor.

45-54 age bracket—16.6 percent, which is over six times as great as the national population rate—to equal the unemployment rate in the 20-24 age category. The age breakdown for the post-release survey was not consistent with the national sample data. There tended to be a direct relationship between age and unemployment—as age increased, unemployment increased.

Color

The rates of unemployment for whites and nonwhites were much higher for released prisoners than those reported for the same groups in the national civilian labor force. For the whites in this study, the rate was 15.1 percent, which was over three times as great as for whites in the national civilian labor force. The nonwhite rate was 22.3 percent, or 2.3 times as great as the unemployment rate in the national civilian labor force. Full-time employment in particular, for white released prisoners, was significantly higher than the rates for the nonwhite released prisoners.

Again, the post-release survey in Baltimore and Philadelphia supported the findings in the national sample on color. The fact that the differences in over-all employment were not as pronounced was a function of a much larger number of nonwhites being employed on part-time jobs. If only full-time employment was used as a measure, the difference was even greater than in the national sample survey.

Marital Status

The rates of unemployment for released prisoners classified according to marital status, showed the same trends as the unemployment rates of those in the national civilian labor force. However, the corresponding rates were higher for the released prisoners. They were very much higher for married and for single persons over 20 years of age. The post-release survey data were more consistent with the trends of the national civilian labor force than with the national sample data, but the national sample data were supported.

Type of Job and Income

Nearly two-thirds of the released prisoners who were employed were working on unskilled and low-wage, semiskilled jobs. Of the remaining one-third, about half were working on skilled jobs and half were working on clerical-sales or more skilled white-collar jobs. Eighty percent of the part-time work was of an unskilled or semiskilled nature, while 62 percent of the full-time employment was of this low-skilled type. These low-skilled jobs were also low paying jobs. The median monthly income for all employed former prisoners was $256; $281 for those employed full-time and $148 for those employed part-time. At least 35 percent were making less than the minimum wage of $200-220 per month, and the median income was far below the median income of the national population. Employment was hard to find and retain, and when found, the wages were often minimal. These observations were supported by the turnover on part-time jobs and the large number who had no employment during the month (10.9 percent).

Length of Time on Release

The crucial period for releasees, as indicated from the data, is the first six months after leaving prison. Those who had been released for a period of less than six months had higher rates of unemployment—23.4 percent compared to a rate of 12.6 percent for those who had been under supervision for six months or more.

Background Factors

Unemployment rates varied by the number of previous commitments. Prior criminal records worked against all released prisoners, but unemployment rates were lower for those with no or only one prior commitment. Whites had much lower rates of unemployment than nonwhites before imprisonment. Prior employment experience was related to employment status.[17] Unemployment decreased as length of time on last job prior to commitment increased, leveling off at two years or more. Those having no former employment experience had the highest post-release unemployment rates. The relationship between prior employment and post-release employment was even more marked for full-time post-release employment. The employment rate was 53 percent for those with no previous employment experience compared to 74 percent for those who had had two years or more of continuous employment on a job prior to commitment. Persons who had skilled jobs before imprisonment were more likely to return to the same type of job, and they had higher rates of employment, and of full-time employment, than those who had worked on semiskilled or unskilled jobs before their prison sentence.

---

[17] This factor has also been shown to be related to recidivism. See Federal Bureau of Prisons, unpublished base expectancy study of Youth Correction Act (YCA) cases, 1965. This was a study of 1001 male YCA cases released during the fiscal year of 1961. The follow-up period was two years from the date of release. Also see Ronald Smircich and Gloria Clemmons, "Employment and the Criminal Offenders," *Research Review*, Department of Institutions, State of Washington, October, 1963, pp. 29-52.

Offense, Institutional Experience, and Release Factors

Narcotics law violators and those committed for burglary, larceny, and possession of stolen goods, and Dyer Act offenses (these usually have high recidivism rates) had higher rates of unemployment and lower rates of full-time employment than those who committed any other type of offense. Those released on parole had lower rates of unemployment and higher rates of full-time employment than those freed on mandatory release. This would be expected as the mandatory release cases are usually poor risks and are not given as much assistance in finding jobs as are parolees. The type of job assignment in the institution was not related to employment status except for those who worked on maintenance-skilled jobs who had low rates of post-release unemployment. While some of those working on maintenance-skilled jobs possessed such skills at the time of commitment, many of them had acquired the skill during institutional confinement. The evaluation of institutional work performance was the best predictor of post-release employment. Those with excellent work ratings had the lowest unemployment rates during the post-release period, and those with fair or poor ratings were less likely to be employed on full-time jobs than those with higher ratings.

Two additional factors which were used for more detailed analysis were educational level and skill level at time of release. Education was generally positively associated with post-release employment status; the rates of unemployment decreased as the amount of education increased. However, a control for age and color indicated that education was significantly associated with the employment of white released prisoners, particularly for full-time employment, but the level of education apparently had no effect on the rates of employment for nonwhites.

Inmates possessing a skill at the time of release were only slightly more likely to be employed than those who did not. However, they were much more likely to hold full-time jobs than those who did not have a skill at the time of release. A control by color indicated that skill level was related to improved employment status for whites, but was not related to the employment status of nonwhites. Whites with skills were more likely to be employed, but this was not true for nonwhites. While being a nonwhite enhances the likelihood that discrimination may be occurring, if training and improved education were effective, they should work to reduce the unemployment of nonwhites. However, they do not seem to work that way. Apparently there are other factors which are more significantly associated with the nonwhite subculture which offset the improved training, education, and job placement assistance. Undoubtedly, some whites may be affected by the same factors, but they apparently constitute a smaller proportion that that of the nonwhites.

The data which seem to indicate that training and education in institutions do not work to the advantage of all groups of inmates may, in fact, be a reflection on the type of training and education that is provided in the correctional framework. Most training that takes place in correctional institutions is not very realistic; most of it is not formalized vocational training, but is on-the-job training of a maintenance and industrial nature. These programs often do not use modern training techniques and equipment, and they seldom simulate working conditions within the community. Further, the inmates usually have little choice concerning programs to which they are assigned. Rarely have the institutions raised the question at initial classification of what the job opportunities are in the community to which an inmate is likely to be released. A sound classification program should be attempting to equate the man's potential and interests with the probable job opportunities in the community to which he eventually will be returned.

The problems of trying to train a man in a correctional setting are very extensive. One alternative is to rely more than at present on the community for the training of the inmates by providing thorough and practical training within the framework of work release programs and educational training release programs. Certainly within the last five years the Federal Bureau of Prisons and a number of state systems have expanded programs in these areas. But unless they are administered carefully and are designed to meet the needs of the particular inmate, they will not be very effective. However, some training and maintenance has to exist within the correctional institution. These programs should also be realistic, meaning that modern techniques and work situations which simulate current industrial situations in the community should be employed. The Federal Bureau of Prisons, recognizing deficiencies in this area, has employed consulting firms during the past year to evaluate the vocational training programs, general educational programs, and prison industries.[18] These evaluations are designed to determine what the Federal Bureau of Prisons might do to improve and expand their programs. Certainly this should be beneficial.

---

[18] During the past year the author has been a research consultant to Sterling Institute, Inc., a private consulting firm which was hired to

While such improvements should help, are they enough? A number of the demonstration programs, such as the Rikers Island Study, and Project Challenge in the District of Columbia Department of Corrections,[19] apparently have not been as effective as expected. Many people who received this ideal training and placement failed to remain on their post-release jobs. While training and placement helped, apparently other factors and conditions which were affecting post-release employment were not being dealt with effectively.

Post-Release Job Placement

The post-release survey clearly indicated that most released prisoners obtained their jobs through the help of family, friends, former employers, and their own efforts. Of the first post-release jobs, 80 percent were obtained through the help of family and friends. While family and friends remained the prime source of assistance in subsequent jobs which were obtained, the releasee came to rely less and less on this source of assistance and more on his own efforts and ingenuity. With post-release jobs being obtained primarily in this fashion, it is understandable why there is a high correlation between previous work experience and post-release employment. This might also explain why inmates who have received training and attained skills often do not obtain employment which utilizes such skills. Professional job placement assistance is needed.

Less than 10 percent of the releasees obtained jobs through federal and state employment agencies which provided the major outside source of assistance. Little assistance, or little benefit from whatever assistance was provided, was obtained from the correctional institution employment service and the federal probation offices. Less than 5 percent of the jobs were obtained through this assistance. While inmates in general were not enthusiastic about such assistance, there was some indication that the aid was extremely beneficial for those few who

---

evaluate the training and industries programs at the Federal Reformatory at Petersburg, Virginia, and the Federal Youth Corrections Institution, Ashland, Kentucky.

[19] The author did an ex post facto assessment of this program for the District of Columbia Department of Corrections.

had learned a skill in prison.[20] The limited use of such assistance may be a reflection of the lack of service that was available, rather than of the failure of such assistance to provide jobs. It also may be a reflection on the inadequacy of existing programs; it is difficult to place persons on jobs if their training has been supervicial.

Industries often prefer to train their own people because of the difficulty in retraining persons who have had superficial training. Therefore, job placement assistance may be even more important than training. The expansion of the community release centers and the expansion and reorganization of employment placement assistance provided by the Federal Bureau of Prisons in cooperation with the U.S. Federal Probation Service should provide the type of assistance needed. However, changes in orientation may be needed to maximize the impact of their services.

AN ALTERNATIVE MODEL

Introduction

Why is it that a released inmate does not remain employed even though he receives training and is placed on a job with reasonable pay? How can we explain the differential employment of skilled white and nonwhite workers, outside of the effects of discrimination? What relevant factors are ignored by the training-placement (opportunity) model? We suggest that two of these factors are the job-related values of an inmate's peer subculture and his extended family.

In his brilliant description of the urban, Negro male streetcorner subculture, Elliott Liebow points up the significance of peer values.

> Moreover, despite their small numbers, the don't-work-and-don't-want-to-work minority is especially significant because they represent the strongest and clearest expression of those values and attitudes associated with making a living which, to varying degrees, are found throughout the streetcorner world. These men

---

[20] George A. Pownall and Charles Wellford, "Employment Problems of Released Prisoners," *Proceedings of the Ninety-Sixth Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association* (Washington: American Correctional Association, 1967), pp. 321-35.

> differ from the others in degree rather than in kind, the principal difference being that they are carrying out the implications of their values and experiences to their logical, inevitable conclusions. In this sense, the others have yet to come to terms with themselves and the world they live in.[21]

In summarizing the factors affecting the streetcorner man, Liebow states:

> The streetcorner man is under continuous assault by his job experiences and job fears. His experiences and fears feed on one another. The kind of job he can get—and frequently only after fighting for it, if then—steadily confirms his fears, depresses his self-confidence and self-esteem until finally, terrified of an opportunity even if one presents itself, he stands defeated by his experiences, his belief in his own self-world destroyed and his fears a confirmed reality.[22]

This does not mean that *all* nonwhites find themselves in similar positions; nor does it mean that *some* whites *do not* find themselves in similar positions. However, it seems likely that this type of subcultural climate is more associated with the nonwhite, urban lower class.

Researchers at Fordham University have developed a conceptualization of the urban lower class subculture and have identified five different subcultural life styles based on differences in value orientation and differences in behavior. These subcultural life styles are identified as "strivers, consistent copers, inconsistent copers, reliefers, and hold-overs."[23]

---

[21] Eliott Liebow, *Tally's Corner* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967), p. 34.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

[23] Martin, "Lower Class Delinquency and Work Programs," p. 447, quoting Madeline Helena Engle, *A Reconceptualization of Urban Lower Class Subcultures* (New York: Juvenile Corrections Project, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Fordham University, January, 1966).

> Strivers are more employable or are already employed, are more anxious to move upward when given the opportunity, and are more likely to have children who are doing reasonably well in school and who are also apt to be only slightly involved in delinquent behavior.... The emphasis strivers put on respectability, security, and mobility works to make their children... highly employable and only slightly delinquent. On the other hand, the variables of employability and delinquency appear to reverse themselves progressively and drastically when attention is shifted toward the other end of the lower-class hierarchy where the hold-overs are found. Hold-overs... are almost totally unemployable, while at the same time highly delinquent in a chaotic, disorganized way. In the middle of the hierarchy, where the inconsistent copers are located, employability is mixed, with work being intermittent and often at jobs on the docks or in construction where there is a daily "shape-up" and delinquency tends to be moderately high and often of the violent gang type. The key to understanding inconsistent copers is that they have a life style which emphasizes fun, excitement, thrills, and a general escape from boredom and routine.[24]

While there is a need for more research concerning these subcultural life styles, an important factor that must be involved in varying degrees is the role of the extended family. Research is being conducted by Bernard Farber at the University of Illinois on the impact of Headstart programs and the relationship of the extended family to the success of this program in raising the children's social IQ. Farber found two extreme types of extended family. One he refers to as "symbolic family estates orientation," and the other as the "domestic family orientation."[25] He concluded:

---

[24] *Ibid*

[25] Bernard Farber, "Symbolic Family Estates and Social Mobility," paper presented at Kent State University, Sociology and Anthropology Colloquium, October, 1967. Family orientation is a function of two aspects. The structural aspect referred to as symbolic family estates orientation is the status of the family within the broader community and provides for symbolic unity of the family. The domestic family orientation refers to the interpersonal relationships between family members. In order for the family to survive as a unit, the roles of its members must be structured in such a way as to reduce interpersonal conflict.

> The unity of the sibling group in the context of upward social mobility helps in socializing the child in ways consistent with the academic demands made upon him. As in the case of emotional health, the intellectual performance of children appears to be affected by the symbolic unity of the group.[26]

He points out that the symbolic family estates orientation provides a motivation to achieve which is lacking in the domestic family orientation.

While the testing of these ideas was not included in the study of released prisoners, they have implications for understanding why some people may not work even when they have a skill and are given job placement assistance. What is suggested is that in spite of skill level and in spite of job assistance, the individual will not be motivated to remain on a steady job, to seek a better job, or to seek opportunities to improve his level of skill or education unless his peer and/or familial subculture is supportive of achievement.

The Model

The following model shows the probable effects of training, placement, and subcultural orientation:

FIGURE B

		Subcultural Orientation	
		Supportive of Achievement and Mobility	Nonsupportive of Achievement and Mobility
Skilled	Placement Assistance	Employed	Unemployed
	No Placement Assistance	Employed	Unemployed
Unskilled	Placement Assistance	Employed	Unemployed
	No Placement Assistance	Employed	Unemployed

---

[26] *Ibid.*

This model consists of eight cells in which the key variable is the type of subcultural orientation. The following propositions can be derived from this model:

1. An individual who has skills and is provided with a job will be employed if his subculture is supportive, but will be unemployed if his subcultural group is not supportive.

2. An individual who has skills and is not provided with job placement assistance will seek work on his own when his subculture is supportive of achievement. He can benefit significantly from job placement efforts. Without such subcultural support, he will be unemployed.

3. A person without skills who receives job placement assistance will remain employed as long as his subcultural group is supportive. Such an individual can benefit from training programs. Without subcultural support, this person also will be unemployed.

4. The individual who has no skills and receives no job placement assistance will find employment on his own when his subcultural group is supportive. However, he is subject to frustrations because the types of jobs available to him will be at the unskilled and menial level. These frustrations will create pressures which make this type of releasee a likely candidate for return to criminal activities unless legitimate solutions are provided. This person can benefit from both training and placement assistance. Without subcultural support, however, this individual will be unemployed and likely to become a failure.

It has been stressed that when the subcultures are not supportive (that is, when the subculture does not provide motivation for achievement and mobility), training and assistance will be ineffective. Former inmates will be unemployed or will work only sporadically on part-time, low-level jobs and thus become likely candicates for return to criminal behavior. If change is to take place in these groups, we must either change the subcultural frame of reference or move the individual to a different and a supportive subculture. It is not easy to move a man from one environment to another; however, work release programs and community release centers have made this possible in a few cases. But for those who return to the same subculture it would appear that we need to spend considerably more time working with the family and extended family prior to the man's return to the community; it seems that this may be the only way to effectively change the orientation from nonachievement to achievement. Analysis that is being done at present on value responses in the post-release survey suggest that this model is applicable. The releasees who were unemployed tended to have attitudes and values which were reflective of a value system which emphasized nonachievement and a lack of concern for upward mobility. While this analysis is still in the process of being completed, the implications for programs in corrections are clearly evident. Certainly there is a need for more extensive research in this area.

DISCUSSION

WALLACE MANDELL
STATEN ISLAND MENTAL HEALTH SOCIETY

Dr. Pownall's findings unequivocally support the position that imprisonment as presently practiced in the United States has practically no more impact on employability than, as others have suggested, it has on future criminal behavior. Criminals with previous histories of stable employment, who have education and skill and are without long criminal histories, return to the community to continue their pattern of obtaining better jobs which they consistently hold. Despite institutional structure and policies, they also continue in these work patterns while in prison, as reflected in the work ratings which their prison supervisors give them. Dr. Pownall's findings also indicate that prison job assignment and training experience have little impact on post-release employment.

Work skill had little effect in improving the employment situation for ex-inmates and the effect noted was limited to white men. Dr. Pownall rejects the possibility that this reflects discrimination in employment practices and presents a theory as to why Afro-Americans do not benefit from the training they receive.

Dr. Pownall's explanation of the lack of relationship between skill and employment status among nonwhites is that these men come from a subculture which is not supportive of a drive for achievement and social mobility. This is a more sophisticated version of the position that nonwhites are not motivated to work and to achieve. The blame is not placed on the individual but on the subculture and family from which he derives. The natural programmatic conclusion from this premise is that the individual must be removed from his subculture and family. I wonder whether societal agencies will be more effective in changing a whole family with techniques currently available when they are failing in changing individuals.

More to the point, however, is an analysis of the generalization about the nonwhite subculture. While it is certainly true that the Afro-

American streetcorner subculture described by Liebow exists, there is no evidence that *all* Afro-American males really accept these values and attitudes. The currently available evidence indicates that at least 73 percent of Afro-American men are at work and want to be at work. In addition, of those at work, 80 percent in an urban center such as Detroit are earning over $80 per week. Sixty-three percent are earning over $100 per week. This suggests that the streetcorner nonworking subculture is a small part of the black, lower class world and represents, in a true sense, only those who have been defeated in their efforts to survive in the economic system. The values and attitudes of these men are the bitter rationalizations built over a lifetime of economic failure.

My own position is that discrimination is a very real factor in the types and levels of jobs available to Afro-Americans and all prisoners. There is differential availability of skill-developing opportunities both in formal educational structures and on-the-job training. Even under recent historical conditions of high employment, Afro-Americans are in the position of "last-hired—first fired." The evidence on unemployment and turnover can be interpreted in this light rather than as reflecting the inner cultural disposition of the men in his sample.

The black prisoners are men whose experience has taught them convincingly that they cannot come to a man's estate in this society, and whose self-confidence is shattered. They reject the opportunities available to them because many experiences have taught them that to hope and to try leads to frustration and hurt. My experience has been that all ex-prisoners, black men in particular, examine very carefully proffered training and jobs offered in or out of prison from two vantage points: How trustworthy is the person offering the new role in society? And, what are the realistic possibilities for a successful outcome? In most instances, they have been able to predict outcomes; the training is inadequate and irrelevant, for jobs which do not exist, and offered by staffs who are unconvinced of the possibility of success. This is not much of a program to overcome a life's history of experience which began with failure in a fourth grade classroom and wended its way through juvenile and youthful offender courts and institutions before final culmination in an adult offender institution. In each study, where the correctional system has been able to offer access to desirable roles in the economy, men have been motivated to learn and to work. Most to the point is that the Afro-Americans have shown the greatest improvement both in employment status and in reduction in recidivism.

Dr. Pownall's findings are clear; releasees currently obtain jobs through their own efforts; only 10 percent have gotten jobs through state employment service offices and another 5 percent through correctional personnel. This reflects the current inability of these agencies to function as managers of transition (social mobility) for this population. The employment structure (job market) discriminates against ex-inmates and against minority populations.

The governmental agency employment service operates in a competitive market in which it tries to obtain jobs. The only service it offers to employers at the present time is prescreening of candidates so that the employer will obtain a better worker through less effort. The governmental employment service agency currently works as a negative screen to provide employers with good candidates so that they will continue to offer jobs to that agency. The ex-inmate is a high risk, low-skilled candidate—high risk in the sense that a training investment is not as likely to be realized. Employment agencies, therefore, tend to push candidates into jobs below the skills of the ex-inmate on the premise that they are realistically available. Such jobs can be obtained by the ex-inmate himself. The basic characteristic of these jobs, as evidenced by Dr. Pownall's findings, is that they are low-paying, high-turnover jobs. In other words, they do not represent desirable economic roles nor do they lead to such positions (beginning of a career ladder).

Having a self-supporting and socially esteemed economic role is a *sine qua non,* though not the exclusive factor, in leaving the criminal life role. Entry into such economic roles is controlled by industry which operates, in the main, on rational profit motive principles, and unions which wish to stabilize labor market competition. These groups do not wish to take high-risk employees. Risk is here defined in terms of evidence of productivity, lateness, absenteeism, supervision expense, and morale disruption. Current programs for offenders operate on the premise that by increasing productivity through increasing skill they will be decreasing the investment in education made by the employer and will induce him to employ a high-risk employee. However, most jobs in the market are entry level jobs and relevant skills are taught on the job. Plant managers are therefore more concerned with reducing lateness, absenteeism, supervision expense, and morale disruption. This is now done by screening out individuals who are likely to evidence these problems since they increase production costs. For instance, most plants plan to operate with a 2-3 percent absentee rate without affecting cost but not with a 10 percent absentee rate. As a result, industry managers are locked into an economic situation which prevents their employing high-risk ex-inmates or minority group members.

Two options currently exist for reducing plant manager opposition to employing prisoners and minority group members. One is subsidized, supportive services to the manager which reduce costs associated with such employees. The other is by tax benefit to offset increased operating costs of utilizing unstable workers.

At the present time, there is practically no tested knowledge about how to operate effective supportive services to the ex-inmate population. The attempts look promising. Until such knowledge and appropriate personnel are available, the subsidizing program must be considered as an immediately available alternative.

The premises of this analysis are that industry and unions which control entry and promotion into economic roles operate on rational bases representing their economic interests. Correctional systems are responsible annually for 2, 000, 000 male members of the labor market. If we assume the male labor market at about 25, 000, 000 workers, correctional systems can be seen as having a significant impact on the labor market. It seems clear that there is a significant economic relationship between the correctional system and the labor market. This requires creation of both planning mechanisms and service mechanisms which relate correctional systems and the economic system of the region in which they both function.

Our proposition here is that the relatively new functions of relating correctional and economic institutions, inmate and job, must become a regular part of the corrections- employment system. Job finding, job development, work role support (counseling) are the personnel components of the new system. Our proposal is that these are the tasks of the social restoration worker who must now be built into the correctional system.

HAROLD STARR
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

In discussing Dr. Pownall's remarks I would like to direct my comments primarily toward two general areas. The first concerns the reported correlations between crime and employment; the second area is his suggested strategy for achieving a reduction in the recidivism rate by modifying subcultural orientations.

Dr. Pownall cites a variety of sources which report positive correlations between crime and unemployment rates at the over-all societal level. There seems to be the implication that a cause and effect relationship exists between crime and unemployment rates. However, it should be noted that crime has risen in countries enjoying prosperity and high levels of general employment. The problem of assuming a direct cause and effect relationship is further complicated by other concomitant factors such as cultural values and their degree of stability, rates of industrialization, population densities, and standards of living. The complexities of these dimensions and their interrelationships make it difficult to relate crime rates directly to any one factor.

While Dr. Pownall provides statistical evidence that the largest proportion of delinquent and criminal behavior is found among the working class (and I would ask for a more refined definition), I would prefer he use the term adjudicated criminal behavior since differential crime rates, in an absolute sense, between classes are often the result of antisocial behaviors being treated differently by the police and courts.

Even if we can accept the assumption that crime in our culture is class-related in terms of the relative (or even absolute) occurrence of criminal behaviors, it still remains to be demonstrated that employment training and job placement for "lower" class persons in general can, in themselves, decrease crime or reduce recidivism. The speaker states that increased training for lower-class persons within the framework of opportunity theory should reduce the crime rate. In theory, this result could ensue if one believed that lower-class persons commit more crimes when unemployed, that potentially antisocial individuals would not commit an offense if they were employed, and that criminally oriented individuals would accept training and employment if these opportunities were made available. A direct cause and effect relationship between crime and unemployment has yet to be demonstrated. The maladaptive behavioral patterns and feelings of alienation of many offenders and parolees prevent their accepting training or stable employment.

Turning now to the speaker's model, I can see the desirability for research to determine the effects of different community subcultural supportive orientations on reducing recidivism among released offenders. On the other hand, it would also perhaps be important to determine the relative contribution toward parolee success of differing supportive orientations provided by institutional and post-institutional sources and services. Most offenders' families do provide a supportive orientation to the parolee; and they aspire to see his post-release achievement in terms of stability of employment and his ability to handle responsibilities. On the other hand, do different institutional climates differentially affect parolees' desire for community success which includes employment? Whether the parolee's peer group affiliations are supportive probably does influence successful community adaptation, but these relationships are probably not determined by chance. One index of successful institutional intervention is that the parolee chooses to affiliate with those who provide him with a supportive orientation for achievement. When institutional intervention is unsuccessful either because of the institutional milieu or because of the inmate's intensive alienation, I would hypothesize that affiliation with nonsupportive peers becomes a reflection and not a cause of community difficulties and inability to obtain and retain employment. It has been observed by some that the consequences of unsuccessful institutional intervention may be that a parolee continues to have associates but not friends.

I propose that success on parole is not primarily caused by ability or availability of a job but is determined by whether the parolee sees himself as part of a community and, more specifically, whether he feels a commitment toward work as a major, purposeful activity in his life. Meaningful education and training for employment within an institutional framework then becomes of prime importance and should be viewed not as ends but as part of a vehicle whereby inmates can gain feelings of self-respect and a sense of worth and dignity which can lead to joining rather than avoiding or fighting society. Thus, education and training serve as complimentary avenues for developing that sense of commitment towards work which insures that opportunity theory for parolees will become a reality.

Just a few additional remarks before closing: Improved education and training programs and institutional image can be concommitantly benefited by the active involvement of other state agencies, business and industry groups, individuals, and agencies concerned with the employment of released offenders in the programming of all education and training efforts within the correctional setting. Education and training personnel within institutions might also improve their effectiveness by jointly articulating their areas of instruction. My bias here is not to rely solely on post-institutional experiences to reduce recidivism but to make use of dedicated and therapeutically oriented personnel and supportive milieus within correctional settings as a means for reducing recidivism. Education and training personnel concerned with the successful occupational placement of released offenders might also give some thought to community follow-through in education and training activities. To this end, MDTA Centers, and other public and private agencies, as well as vocational schools, should be asked to participate in providing supportive education and training services to parolees.

I agree with Dr. Pownall that when a released offender finds his environment to be supportive, recidivism should be decreased. Thus, I would expect that joint involvement of the community and the correctional institution in education and training programs for inmates would be beneficial in setting the stage for successful rehabilitation and reduced rates of recidivism.

MARSHALL H. COLSTON
THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

I shall endeavor to respond to certain aspects of Dr. Pownall's paper without being overly redundant with regard to the remarks that have been made by the two discussants who have already shared their views with you.

First of all, I should say I am in substantial agreement with the remarks and reactions of Dr. Wallace Mandell and Dr. Harold Starr, although Dr. Mandell's discussion of this paper is more pertinent to my point of view.

I must reject the "streetcorner" theory as not having any significant theoretical or practical relationship to the employment problems of released prisoners. Any attempt to isolate causal factors by the use of narrow, theoretical concepts such as Eliott Liebow attempts to do in his recent work, *Tally's Corner,* results in the exclusion of a whole raft of economic, social, ethnic, political, and sociological considerations. Also, this results in an inordinately small amount of weight given to a number of failing systems and institutions which are quite relevant to the educational, economic, physical, and emotional stability of the released prisoner. In short, Dr. Pownall treats this problem as though the released prisoner is almost wholly and solely responsible for his own rehabilitation, and that his main difficulty would appear to be a short job market; if he happens to be a Negro, his difficulty will be somewhat increased.

My major criticism of this paper's approach to the problem is that it does not deal in any significant way with the weaknesses in our system of health, education, and welfare which has an important bearing on every American's life from the cradle to the grave. The questions of quality education, adequate health care and standards, and the availability of quality welfare services are important elements in the prevention of crime and in rehabilitation after a crime has been committed, the price has been paid, and the prisoner is released to make his own way in a highly competitive world. It is unrealistic to expect that American attitudes and interest in prison systems at the federal, state, and local levels are anything but primitive at this time. This is not to say that prison officials, sociologists, social workers, psychologists, criminologists, and penologists are not concerned. The point is, if the body-politic were to make a list of 30 priorities in this country today, the question of rehabilitation and employment of released prisoners would be 30th on that list. If the list were cut to 29, the employment problems of released prisoners would probably be dropped.

Aside from teaching the prisoner a marketable skill, it would appear that the thrust of training and rehabilitation in prisons should deal with the questions of motivation and emotional rehabilitation, both of which are absolutely essential for success in the open, competitive society in which Americans live.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice presented a report from its task force on corrections and had this to say in regard to clinical services available in the various prison systems in America today:

> An important element in classification, screening, and placement is psychological testing and diagnosis. Measures of intelligence, aptitude, and personality traits are helpful in assessing the potential performance of inmates in available programs.
>
> Clinicians are in short supply and their services are not readily available to most correctional institutions in the United States. As a result, many clinicians serving correctional institutions do so on a part-time or consulting basis. In recent years, and particularly in juvenile institutions, the psychiatric and psychological services have been used to train staff and consult on programs even more than provide diagnosis and therapy for the inmates. Some clinicians view almost all crime as evidence of character disorder and assume that therapy is appropriate for most inmates. The most highly developed psychotherapeutic services however, such as those in Massachusetts and Wisconsin, report they give primary attention only to about 10 percent of the institutional population. In youthful, particularly female populations, the esti-

> mates of percentage of inmates in need of psychotherapy run from 15 percent to 50 percent. These are generally inmates with severe personality disturbances.

This statement from the task force report on corrections would seem to illustrate (perhaps not as conclusively as some might wish) that merely teaching a released prisoner the job skill is not sufficient to insure his adjustment once he is released from the prison environment. I believe that Dr. Pownall's paper is seriously remiss in that it does not adequately deal with this important aspect of rehabilitation.

There are a number of questions which remain unexplored, unstudied, and unanswered. For example, how does the obvious institutional exploitation of prison labor affect the motivation of the individual while he is still incarcerated? And what percentage of the inmate's labor effort is productive on an efficiency scale which measures the same effort for the same type of work in a factory outside of a prison wall? And what about the attitudes of federal, state, and local governments? And what about the attitude of the public in general? In short, is it possible to develop a program which can insure the employment of or reconcile the employment problems of released prisoners without revamping our systems of education, health, and welfare and, at the same time, modify public attitudes to the point where the released prisoner can enjoy a fair amount of acceptance and respect? These and other questions are much too serious to be ignored. The theoretical considerations alluded to in Dr. Pownall's paper seem to have little or no relevance to concrete and pragmatic remedies and solutions. It is not enough to talk in terms of supporting subcultures as though this is an important key to unlocking the solutions to these problems.

I would like to make six points which may suggest some directions which those of us who are interested in the solutions to these problems might take.

1. Correctional systems are a part of the American way of handling its problems and must be viewed as such. At the present time it is a failing system which must be revised philosophically and physically (perhaps decentralized), and it must be treatment-oriented.

2. The American school system must become more relevant to society. It is now a failing system that does a considerable amount of training, but little educating. Hence, only 45 percent of the whites and 10 percent of the Negroes that graduate from its high schools are prepared to go on to college. Moreover, many of those who do not

continue to college are not prepared, except in a limited way, to fit into the slots for which these students were presumably prepared in the first place. The third point grows out of the second.

3. The quality of leadership must be increased and felt at all levels in America. Leadership which caters to a basically conservative society is not going to bring about the changes needed to cope with American problems, including the problem of corrections. There is an urgent need for creative, intelligent minds in terms of social, political, and economic reform. Reform must take place before one can realistically expect changes in the prison system.

4. The problem of racism is going to have to be solved in this country. Race not only works against ethnic minorities but all disadvantaged people. It also works against the maximum development of many of our institutions and systems designed to insure equal opportunity and justice for all. In regard to justice for the released prisoner, federal, state, and local courts need overhauling. This is particularly true of the local and state courts where a good deal of injustice is evident in the manner in which convictions are obtained, mostly in cases involving minorities and the disadvantaged. For the past ten years the U.S. Supreme Court has spent considerable time trying to correct injustices perpetrated on individuals by overturning many cases for a variety of reasons. In effect, it has inadvertantly begun a long overdue court reform by exposing serious weaknesses in the present system. Also, the bail system used by the lower courts is outrageously unfair. It is arbitrarily administered and, as one might expect, consistently works to the disadvantage of minorities and poor people.

5. A way must be found to deal with the question of conjugal rights of prisoners. In my judgment, this question poses both constitutional and human rights considerations in that the husband is not only punished but his family also suffers. This important question also has serious ramifications for the emotional and mental health of the married prisoner. No one can deny the problem of homosexuality in American prisons today. To speak seriously of rehabilitation and motivation in the prison environment while such a problem exists for the married prisoner and his family, is akin to tilting at windmills. There has been one inconclusive case testing the denial of conjugal rights in the United States of a married woman whose husband was in prison. The federal, state, and local prison systems ought to assume an affirmative initiative in the resolution of this problem. I need not recite at this point, the social ills, the moral problem, or the emotional frustrations that are the result of denial of conjugal rights. The point is that this problem does not promote a wholesome attitude toward society in the prison.

6. Finally, clinical and therapeutic tools for prisoner rehabilitation must be given a high priority in correctional systems at the federal, state, and local levels. Perhaps in reforming the system itself, which is also an urgent priority, the reformers will properly assess and accord to therapy its role in prisoner rehabilitation. Certainly there is no justification for the denial of clinical services for those who need them in the prison environment. Two very obvious consequences of therapy wherever its need has been indicated by diagnostic tools are: (1) it would serve to protect and perhaps make functional and useful a human person; and (2) it would ultimately serve to promote the peace and tranquility of the community in terms of rights, lives, and property of others.

Section V

Gerald G. Somers, Chairman

CHANGING INMATES THROUGH EDUCATION

CALVIN B. MICHAEL
EASTERN UNIVERSITY

Very little is known about changes wrought in the attitudes and/or behaviors of inmates by the educational programs of prisons. Much is asserted and a great deal inferred from knowledge in other areas. Speculation is rife. Nevertheless, scientific knowledge in correctional education is sparse.

This condition is attested to by several things. First, no book on correctional education has been published since two pioneering works which appeared before World War II.[1] True enough, a recently popular volume by Fader and Shaevitz[2] provides extensive description of a program, but it does not attempt to place the program or its accompanying research in any larger design nor to relate it to previous work. Similarly, the eschewal of formal educational and vocational training programs at Highfields[3] did not constitute a deliberate test of certain assumptions about the effects of such programs; thus, the report—excellent and valuable though it is—does not report an educational study.

A second and more important indication of the state of knowledge in this field is the general dearth of reports on empirical studies. For example, only six doctoral dissertations reporting studies in this area have appeared since 1950.[4] The titles make it clear to any reader that three of these will tell nothing about the efficacy of education programs in changing inmates. In the Center for Correctional Education, we have compiled an unpublished bibliography of slightly more than 100 articles appearing outside the *Journal of Correctional Education* since 1940; less than 10 percent meet the most relaxed criteria for research reports. The level of this productivity is emphasized when it is noted that 156 studies of small groups appeared in the first five years of the period just cited[5]—years, by the way, when interest was small and the nation was at war. The *Journal* itself seldom publishes such studies although many an author will doubtless be outraged at this cavalier dismissal of his perceptive report of a successful practice.

---

[1] Austin W. McCormick, *The Education of Adult Prisoners* (New York: National Society for Penal Information, 1926); W. M. Wallack, G. M. Kendall, and H. L. Briggs, *Education Within Prison Walls* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939).

[2] Daniel N. Fader and Morton H. Shaevitz, *Hooked on Books* (New York: Berkeley Publishing Co., 1966). See also Daniel N. Fader and Elton B. McNeil, *Hooked on Books: Program and Proof* (New York: Berkeley Publishing Co., 1968), which adds an extensive report of the research accompanying this notable program.

[3] H. Ashley Weeks, *Youthful Offenders at Highfields* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1963).

It is, in fact, much more the latter of which the bibliographic stuff of correctional education is made. It is an amalgam largely of eyewitness accounts, participant-observer reports, and magisterial injunctions leavened only slightly by occasional doubts and baked until past done in the fiery furnace of piety. Although we might admire the zeal and the motives of the authors so holding forth, we are left without a solid basis for evaluating their claims, their reports, or their proposals. It is such a condition that warranted the remarks of Glaser in a follow-up article to his report on studies of the federal prison system.[6] His recommendations to the field were succinct: (1) broaden the challenge to inmates, (2) change the social relationships among inmates in education, (3) become and remain honest, and (4) conduct research. The desperate need for each of these—particularly the latter two—can be testified to by anyone with even cursory knowledge of present practices, present theory, and present study in correctional education.

---

[4] James S. Beadle, "A Survey and Analysis of the Education Program of the Academic School of the State Prisons of Southern Michigan, Jackson" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965); Carlton H. Bowyer, "Correctional Education in Penal and Correctional Institutions in the United States" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1958); John W. Glenn, "Status and Effectiveness of General and Vocational Education Programs in Correctional Institutions in Missouri" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1966); Harvey Hershey, "Adult Education and Personality of Inmates of the State Prison of Southern Michigan" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1966); Ernest W. Patrick, "Significant Factors Associated with the Success of Vocational Trainees and Parolees at the Federal Reformatory, El Reno, Oklahoma" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University); Theodore M. Zink, "A Study of the Effect of Prison Education on Societal Adjustment" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1962).

[5] Fred L. Strodtbeck and A. Paul Hare, "Bibliography of Small Group Research: From 1900 through 1953," *Sociometry*, 17(1954), pp. 107-78.

Modification of the view expressed thus far is required by acknowledging the existence of many fugitive empirical materials, for example, unpublished research reports to funding agencies, intra-organizational accounts of institutional studies, and conference papers and proceedings which appear irregularly or are distributed to a limited clientele. But buttressing what has been said about the state of knowledge in this field is the fact that no one seems to know how many correctional educators there are in the country[7] or, for that matter, the nature and extent of education and training programs in the state and national penal institutions.[8]

Perhaps at this juncture, it is important to establish more clearly the conceptual framework of this paper. Reactions to what has been said thus far could very well include substantial demurrers by persons who know of unimpeachable evidence demonstrating how some inmates have achieved literacy and how others have made academic achievements of diverse sorts; many prisoners have satisfied the requirements of diplomas and degrees and others have met the admission standards of various educational institutions. On the vocational training side, there are all those who have acquired a salable skill, developed a cluster of vocational abilities, or achieved a vocational proficiency of high order. Do not such results warrant rejection of this author's assertion about the state of knowledge in correctional education? They do not.

---

[6] Daniel Glaser, *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964), and "The Effectiveness of Correctional Education," *American Journal of Corrections*, 28(1966), pp. 4-9.

[7] At the Center for Correctional Education we have been involved in preliminary surveys for a status study of correctional educators. One persistent difficulty of the respondents (prison administrators) was determining who on their staffs could be considered legitimately as having such a classification.

[8] Contrary to popular belief, the annually published directory of the American Correctional Association does not contain such information nor can one infer it from what is reported there.

That they do not is indicated by the modifier "correctional." Taken as evidence, the results testify to the effects of education and vocational training. It requires demonstration that such results are of *correctional* import. It is assumed to be so, but the folklore of corrections includes the stories of the one convict who became a forger because he learned to write in prison and the other who used his prison-trained welding skills to become a better safe-cracker. These folk-tales refer to suspicions about the "treatment potency" of educational and vocational training. They also raise important questions about the meaning of "correction," i.e., about what is a "criminal."

Doubtless beyond the scope of this paper, and in some ways a less central issue, nonetheless it is quite impossible to examine the literature on correctional education without considerations of such questions. The ultimate criterion of the success of a prison system is the reduction of recidivism. Unless the changes in inmates are accompanied by or cause differences in their behavior upon release, the changes in prison have meaning only for that setting. Prisoners may find incarceration more bearable or institutions may achieve better operation, but if releasees return to crime, these things have only limited social or personal value. Thus, when studies demonstrate the greater effectiveness of a particular curriculum or method, the finding may be inconsequential in this larger sense.

The latter point is especially relevant to an evaluation of the many personal reports of educational successes with this method or that program. It is also painfully appropriate to an assessment of some of the empirical studies. In Hall and Marshall's investigation of the contribution of homemaking education to the rehabilitation of women prisoners, it appeared that the demonstration method was the most effective approach to such students.[9] (Functional illiteracy plagued 64 percent of the inmates so the result is not surprising.) The study provides no knowledge of how differentially successful programs inside the prison correlate with the post-release success of inmates. It is at least theoretically possible that a particular educational method might be less good than another—say in terms of subject matter achievement—yet have more treatment potency, i.e., more inmates would be rehabilitated. In this vein, it can be noted that the principles upon which the Englewood Demonstration Project (EDP) were based are exceptionally consistent with contemporary concepts in psychotherapy and with personality and educational theory.[10] However, the evidence from the EDP does not indicate significantly superior scholastic achievements by inmates in the project; but scholastic achievements were not the sole or even principal goals.[11] Thus, we are forced to ask: With no more than what we know, which studies tell us most about the efficacy of certain practices?

---

[9] O. A. Hall and E. Marshall, "Homemaking Education in Rehabilitation," *American Vocational Journal*, 31(1956), pp. 17-18.

In one instance we can assert only that demonstration techniques seem to be preferable institutional styles with students who have language problems. (Was a research study necessary to determine this?) In the second case, it appears that academic learning is not much affected—positively or negatively—when a broader conception of education leads to different (additional) emphases in school programs.[12]

---

[10] See John J. Galvin (ed.), *Re-Educating Confined Delinquents* (Washington: Bureau of Prisons, U. S. Department of Justice, 1965); and especially, John J. Galvin (ed.), *Supplement to "Re-Educating Confined Delinquents"* (Washington: Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice, 1965).

[11] Such a result is not surprising. The famous Eight Year Study yielded similar results: students in the "progressive" schools did as well in school subjects and were as successful in college courses as their peers from the "traditional" schools. The differences between the groups lay in the superiority of the progressive school graduates in such qualities as initiative, cooperation, problem-solving, creativity, and analytical thinking. For more extensive discussion of evaluation in the Eight Year Study, refer to Eugene Smith, Ralph W. Tyler and staff, *Appraising and Recording Student Progress* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1942).

[12] An explication of this view was provided by the Director and Associate Director of the E.D.P. in Frank N. Jacobson and Eugene N. McGee, "Resistance to Education," *Journal of Correctional Education,* 16(1964), pp. 17-22.

(*Maybe* a study was needed to show that subject matter achievement does not suffer.) What these studies "prove" is little more than that something was attempted and something was accomplished. This is about as much as was found in an investigation of the effects of homogenous grouping upon reading achievement of prisoners.[13] This report, in fact, illustrates an all too common quality of the studies in correctional education: they usually lack precise design, methodological rigor, and statistical sophistication. The reason for this condition is suggested by the fact that this study was based upon an assertion made by the experimenter in a bald contradiction of the facts. Thus, he remarked that "investigators seem to agree that homogeneous grouping in reading is slightly superior to intact, ungrouped grades."[14] Yet, reviewing the findings of educational science, Russell and Fea say "Research... showed no advantage for either" kind of grouping.[15] Studies of grouping practices have been conducted in elementary, secondary, and higher education since the early decades of the century. Competent reviewers for years have reported statements such as that of Russell and Fea. The weight of all the evidence is in behalf of a generalization that links differentiated achievement to teaching methods differentiated for a host of student characteristics. The fact that even the simplest learning task involves a variety of learner abilities and the fact that the quality of different abilities is not consistent in a particular learner have led one wag to assert that "the only thing you can homogenize is milk."

In addition to these studies and "personal experiments" conducted in ignorance of research evidence, there are others which utilize procedures which constitute violations of the protocols of the test instruments used, particularly those relating to frequency of use, culture-fairness, and age-grade level of students. It is also common for "experiments" to be carried out in the absence of any control group and without sufficiently guarding against the operation of the "Hawthorne effect."[16] This latter circumstance appears to be the instance with two well-known series of investigations, the CASE projects at the National Training School for Boys[17] and the experimental work at the Draper Correctional Center.[18] Substantive questions about the studies are raised by the great publicity surrounding them *during* their conduct with the resultant heavy traffic of observers. Moreover, the investigators have been frequent participants in professional meetings, reporting their work in progress. Clearly, such factors are profound examples of the possibility of the Hawthorne effect.

---

[13] Roger L. Gwartney, "Literacy Training at El Reno Reformatory," *Journal of Correctional Education,* 17(1965), pp. 23-25.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 3.

[15] David H. Russell and Henry R. Fea, "Research on Teaching Reading," in *Handbook of Research on Teaching,* ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), p. 912.

An interesting dimension of these projects is their heavy reliance on "behavior modification," "contingency management," and programmed learning materials. Strict adherence to behavioristic conceptions renders meaningless much of the rhetoric in corrections about changes in values and self-concept. The CASE projects have carried the implications of reinforcement theory—the underlying conceptual base for all the projects—to a more complete end and special environmental facilities have been constructed.[19] That such projects are not solely empirical nor strictly behaviorist is provided, however, by the employment of such phrases as "the welfare state" (in describing the typical institution) and by references to inmates' "improved attitudes" (a concept rather vigorously resisted by behaviorists). Nevertheless, they represent better examples of research than is typical in correctional education. Thus, the sampling procedures in CASE and the intended follow-up of releasees promise results which have greater dependability than is commonly true.

---

[16] The term refers to a situation in which the experimental conditions are such that the mere fact that a person is taking part in an experiment or being observed will tend to produce improvements in his performance. The original study is reported in Fritz J. Roethlisberger and W. J. Dickson, *Management and the Worker* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940).

[17] See for example, Harold L. Cohen, James A. Filipczak, and John S. Bis, "CASE Project: Contingencies Applicable for Special Education," mimeographed report on research performed under Grant No. 65017, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1965; "CASE II—Model," mimeographed report.

[18] These projects are described in a variety of unpublished manuscripts and conference addresses as, for example, "Preliminary Findings: Draper Correctional Center Project in Education and Rehabilitation by Self-Instruction," unpublished manuscript, 1961; John M. McKee, "Reinforcement and the Convict Culture," a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Correctional Association, 1964; and Donna M. Seay, "The Roles of the Teacher for the Effective Use of Programmed Instruction in a Correctional Setting," a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Correctional Education Association, 1966.

The outcomes of the studies will have to be judged against the scanty evidence obtained thus far about the long-run influence of education and training. The results of a few studies indicate that participation in school per se is significantly related to post-release success. Zink,[20] in his "pilot study," found a high positive correlation between prison school attendance and socially accepted post-release conduct. Saden[21] reported significantly higher proportions of successes for parolees who had been students in the prison school as compared to nonstudent parolees. A similar finding had been earlier reported in a study of parolees from Joliet Penitentiary.[22] In this investigation, however, students and nonstudents were paired on a number of important criteria, providing a more rigorous test of the influence of schooling. These two studies, plus a carefully conducted investigation by Schnur,[23] have yielded, thus far, the most impressive data in support of the correctional value of education. Other studies report relationships of education and training to post-release success, but, as for example with Glenn,[24] the absence of suitable controls renders the results question-

[19] A fictional account of a society completely organized on behaviorist outlines is provided in B. F. Skinner, *Walden Two* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1948).

[20] Theodore M. Zink, "A Study of the Effect of Prison Education...."

[21] S. J. Saden, "Correctional Research at Jackson Prison," *Journal of Correctional Education,* 15(1962), pp. 22-26.

[22] Head Instructor, *Education in Prison and Success on Parole,* Stateville Correspondence School Monograph Series No. 1, 1941.

[23] Alfred C. Schnur, "The Educational Treatment of Prisoners and Recidivism," *American Journal of Sociology,* 54(1948), pp. 142-47.

[24] John Glenn, "Status and Effectiveness of General and Vocational...."

able. In like fashion, a follow-up of releasees from the United States Detention Barracks[25] cannot really be said to indicate that vocational training makes a difference; less than 30 percent of the sample returned the questionnaire and only half of those had been employed sometime, although three-fourths of the respondents "felt" the training they received was valuable.

Characteristics of all the studies reported raise questions about the nature of the participants in correctional programs of education and vocational training. In almost all programs, they are volunteers (in one form or another), and the fact of and reasons for their volunteering may be the most significant fact of all. An indication of this is gained from Hershey's[26] study where 32 pairs of inmates were carefully matched on a host of factors (age, previous schooling, recidivism, length of sentence, offense categories, etc.) and differentiated on the basis that one member of each pair was a student in the penitentiary school and one was not. The subjects were administered the Sixteen Factor Personality Test. Clear differences among the two groups were found. Although both groups were more rigid and undependable than the general adult population, the school participants were significantly more so than the nonstudents. Moreover, the students were characterized as avoiding compromise, lacking in internal standards, less inclined to experiment, and less able to exhibit leadership qualities or to be productive in group-oriented tasks—in other words, more conforming. Findings such as these raise to paramount concern the statement of an inmate that "maybe the men who seek training are trying to straighten themselves out."[27]

Such a factor seems an adequate explanation for the results in Rose's study in the English Borstal.[28] "Progress in the institution," which Rose found to be a significant factor in success upon release, appears to describe the same phenomenon referred to by Neese. Though not as widely known as the much cited work of Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck,[29] his conclusions are similar: methods of and paths to reform are legion; success is individual. Thus, the studies themselves and the interpreters of them have foundered typically on the same rocks. We really do not know whether releasees are successful because they were successful in the prison's educational programs or whether the two successes are results (possibly cumulative) of other changes in inmates.

---

[25] Council for Research and Evaluation, "The USDB Vocational Follow-up Study," final report by John D. Nichols and Stanley L. Brodsky (Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: United States Disciplinary Barracks, no date).

[26] Harvey Hershey, "Adult Education and Personality...."

[27] Robert Neese, *Prison Exposures* (Philadelphia: Chilton, 1959).

[28] A. G. Rose, *Five Hundred Borstal Boys* (Oxford, England: Basel Blackwell, 1954).

To the latter point, some persons have already said, "So what?" Their argument is that if education and vocational training enhance the lives of persons (including ex-convicts), they are desirable—nay, necessary—ingredients of the prison's program. To that, one can only reply that it may be so, but with such a viewpoint, it behooves correctional educators to be more modest and/or less naive about their claims. Moreover, to accept such an argument would suggest that only the "corrected" inmate should be admitted to programs, and the programs should be predicated on assumptions about enhancement of, not change in, inmates.

The apparent harshness of this view is thrust upon us by the dilemma which underlies this paper: the necessity of conducting programs for criminals in the absence of clear understandings of criminality or its correction. Goffman,[30] for example, has provided eloquent arguments and evidence supporting the view that the stigmatizing which is a consequence of criminal behavior may be of itself a significant force in correction of behavior. If we turn to psychodynamic theory, we find some disquieting findings in studies of mental illness: the rate of cure in psychotherapy is about the same as for spontaneous remission, i.e., the disappearance of symptoms in the absence of any treatment.[31] Could a similar condition be at work among delinquents and criminals?

---

[29] Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, *500 Criminal Careers* (New York: Knopf, 1930), and *After-Conduct of Discharged Offenders* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1946).

[30] Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Spectrum Books, 1963).

[31] Hans J. Eysenck, *The Effects of Psychotherapy* (New York: International Science Press, 1966).

There are a few supportive findings in some careful studies of probationers.[32] Moreover, there is some evidence also that the conditions probationers must meet are not so relevant as believed: thus, probation per se may be consequential or "spontaneous remission of criminality" may occur during probation. Whether stigmatization is curative or spontaneous remission operative, there is little solid evidence in behalf of a belief in the correctional powers of education and vocational training. The profession needs research that confirms or refutes such a belief and that examines more carefully particular programs, methods, or educational styles. In my view, the presence of education and vocational training programs in prisons can be validated only by proof that they are treatment-potent. That they ease the burden of imprisonment is not sufficient reason for their support, let alone their improvement.

There is little point in arguing whether schooling can change behaviors or attitudes. We know that it can. We are in the process of learning more and more about what teaching styles, media, and settings are most effective in terms of the life styles and life spaces of particular learners and in terms of whether cognitive, affective, or psychomotor goals are sought. We are learning more about teaching and learning not only because investigators and investigative processes have become more sophisticated, but also because the worlds of scholarship and practice have merged. Think for a moment of how many innovations of recent years developed from such cooperation: new math, the nongraded high school, team teaching, and sensitivity training are only a few. From this review, it should be obvious that correctional education is still without its allies in the world of scholarship. We have little dependable knowledge in this field, because there have been few efforts to obtain any. Whether that condition will change is a topic for another speculative paper. That it needs to change is believed to be a valid conclusion of this paper.

---

[32] See in this regard the discussion of "probation" in Donald R. Taft and Ralph W. England, Jr., *Criminology* (4th ed.; New York: Macmillan Co., 1964).

DISCUSSION

SIDNEY A. FINE*
THE W. E. UPJOHN INSTITUTE FOR EMPLOYMENT RESEARCH

I had grave misgivings concerning my credentials, or perhaps I should say expertise, for discussion Professor Michael's paper. Could a one-year internship as a clinical psychologist 30 years ago at Rikers Island penitentiary in New York City and two years in rehabilitation research six years ago at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington provide an adequate base for presuming to discuss a closely reasoned piece of integrative research ? Furthermore, I had left prison work because I found the cognitive dissonance intolerable, the professed goals for rehabilitation on the one hand and the actual environment on the other a dissonance I felt intensely, precisely because I was working under Austin McCormick and the Osborne philosophy.

However, Professor Michael's most engaging presentation of his revised paper has put me at ease, and I feel much more confident that we are kindred spirits laboring in the same vineyard and that my remarks, rather than carping criticism, will be found germane. It turns out that I am drawing as much on my recent work as a consultant in vocational education research as on my earlier background in corrections and rehabilitation.

First, let me say that after two days of papers on education in penal institutions, instead of being gone 30 years, I feel that I just left the room for half an hour and returned to pick up the discussion. The same issues are being discussed: work as therapy and as a preventative of recidivism; vocational education as preparation for work; the need for more research; the call to become and remain honest.

There is a difference. The talk is plainer, more straight-forward, more honest. The percentage of rubbish—the cover-up for dissonance and confusion—seems significantly reduced. This, too, is progress and undoubtedly a sign of the times.

---

*The positions of the author are not necessarily those of The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

My comments on Professor Michael's paper are concerned with three problems: (1) research in vocational education and the value of its findings; (2) the need to focus upon yourselves and your jobs as vocational educators; and (3) concepts concerning the inmate and his ultimate vocational adjustment.

RESEARCH FINDINGS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Professor Michael bears down hard on the need to evaluate vocational education against the ultimate criterion of any rehabilitative effort in prison—the reduction of recidivism. Thus, he would like to see research that shows not only that vocational training in prison achieves proximate or intermediate objectives, but also that it achieves correction as evidenced by offenders staying out of prison.

I contend that the possibility of pointing to this or that vocational education course or, for that matter, recreational or industrial effort, in prison as specifically reducing recidivism is remote indeed. These efforts are merely vehicles for many variables, including such difficult to control variables as teachers, peers, ambience (climate of institution), labor market upon release, etc., not to speak of a host of demographic variables. I think that the research that *is* designed and executed tends to reflect a belief system and probably reinforces it. I conducted such research myself at St. Elizabeths Hospital, and despite heroic efforts to control variables, I was defeated—although many felt that the results were effective as a demonstration. If one succeeds in designing and executing a study to isolate a factor or two, his results are inevitably attributed to the Hawthorne effect, and further research is indicated. On the other hand, if the research is global, one hears the criticism that it demonstrates nothing or that it is not practical.

I think we have to believe in the value of education and indeed be modest about our claims for it, as Professor Michael suggests. I am rather dubious about the value of vocational education alone to prepare inmates for jobs, considering the present state of our institutions. However, I am also inclined to believe that vocational education may be as good, if not better, a vehicle for communicating with offenders as any. I will have more to say about this later.

In this same context I should like to urge that in our zeal for specific knowledge we give up the criterion notion of "payoff" for everything we do. This does not differ from the inmate's criterion. I should imagine it would be very difficult to "change" inmates in the direction of positive citizenship if we use the same social arithmetic that he does. We have never succeeded in convincing him that "crime doesn't pay" and I do not believe we ever will. I think crime is bad and evil because it undermines individuals and society. Unless our behavior reflects our belief in this ethical notion, I think we are doomed to failure from the outset. This type of thinking places me squarely in the camp of those who say we should ***enhance*** the environments of our prisons and make special efforts to have them supply opportunities for "enhanced" lives. After all, it is rather indicated by the studies that have been done that the great majority of offenders became such because of lack of opportunity and lack of anything uplifting in their lives.

In conclusion, I reject Professor Michael's point that "the presence of education and vocational training programs in prisons can be validated only by proof that they are treatment-potent. That they ease the burden of imprisonment is not sufficient for their support, let alone their improvement." I reject it on the grounds that it is both too academic in its search for proof, and also somehow wrong in its implicit value—searching for a payoff.

I turn now to your role as educators in the penal institutions, with your day-to-day concerns of selecting inmates for your programs, organizing curricula, adapting methods and media, and measuring progress.

ROLE OF PRISON EDUCATORS

I think it is useless to think of education in prisons as being a *force* for change until you have considered whether you have made your job an *opportunity* for change. You can do this by recognizing that the tasks you perform are either prescriptive as far as end results, methods, procedures, and behaviors are concerned, or discretionary. In other words, the content of your jobs is either specified or left to your judgment. I know your job descriptions do not make this clear, but you are professionals and you must come to understand that by that very token you have large areas of discretion. Now this area of discretion is the area which offers you the opportunity to do a better job than you are doing.

Consider your functions: with regard to people they are primarily instructing/coaching;[1] with regard to data and ideas, your function is coordinating. In these areas you have wide latitude for judgment. For example, you can re-examine the content of your curricula and the teaching methods you use. What you discover and apply from this re-examination is the basis for establishing your identity as an innovator, experimenter, and person who raises the vision of his students.

Do you need research to tell you how to go about this ? If you do, you are in the wrong job. If your hand has to be held to guide you out of the cozy spot you have made for yourself within the framework of prison prescription, then you are playing the establishment game — "don't rock the boat"—rather than practicing your profession. In the final analysis, *you* must set the forces into motion that can help the individual inmate. You can only do this through the discretionary part of your job.

INMATE TRAINING

Finally, let us take a look at the inmate and at a few concepts which have some relevant implications for his ultimate adjustment. I offer these concepts with even greater confidence than when I came, because I feel that support for them was implied in some degree by almost every paper at this seminar. The context of these concepts relates to the problem we have assigned ourselves of training inmates so that they obtain jobs when they return to society, become self-sufficient, and thus stay out of trouble and jail.

As you know, the primary attack we have made upon this problem is that of providing vocational training. You have heard reports of the MDTA, Rikers Island, and Lorton studies, and you must also know that while the immediate and intermediate results are good and encouraging, the longer term results are discouraging. As one employer who had hired one of the trained released offenders said when contacted after the young man had left him said, "Look, the fact is that before you guys trained him he was a plain son-of-a-bitch; now after you guys got through with him, he's a trained son-of-a-bitch."

---

[1] For definitions, see Sidney A. Fine. ***Functional Job Analysis Manual*** (Washington: The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research).

We have encountered this same problem in MDTA programs and various similar efforts, and it seems to reduce to this: Performing effectively on a job takes more than the skills learned in a vocational training course. I have focused hard on this problem in the past year or two and have conceptualized it as follows. Total performance involves three different types of skill: adaptive, functional, and specific content. The effective performer has acquired all these types of skill and mixes them appropriately in a job that suits him. I believe this is what is behind Professor Michael's observation that "even the simplest learning task involves a variety of learner abilities and the fact that the quality of different abilities is not consistent in a particular learner has led one wag to assert that 'the only thing you can homogenize is milk.'"

What are these skills and how are they acquired? I cannot go into detail here,[2] *but briefly: Adaptive skill* is concerned with how an individual deals with time (punctuality), space (transportation to and from work), temperament (impulse control), finances (budgeting), etc. This skill is acquired mostly in childhood from parents and peers in the family situation. ***Functional skill*** is concerned with those generalized physical, mental, and interpersonal abilities that are applied to data, people, and things—the objects of work performance. This skill is acquired mostly in school and through various focused hobby or work activities. Finally, there is the ***specific content skill*** which is concerned with those abilities required by and acquired in a particular job-worker situation. This type of skill is acquired, and effective performance achieved, when the worker finds his adaptive and functional skills to be suitable to the conditions of the job as he brings them to bear in the specific situation. For example, a worker may in general possess the adaptive skill of "getting along well with people." He may take a job which will require him to get along with an obnoxious supervisor, Mr. Jones. Applying one of his adaptive skills to the specific situation, he succeeds in making Mr. Jones like him and is able to "get along" with him. Thus, the worker has developed the specific content skill of getting along with Mr. Jones. Each job-worker situation involves acquiring a great many such specific content skills to achieve optimum performance.

Using this conceptualization, it is possible to understand why no amount of vocational training can prepare an inmate for a job unless there is some adjustment or change in his adaptive skills. A good example of the importance of adaptive skills is Professor Michael's report on the Hershey experiment which compared students versus nonstudents in the prison. As you recall, the students were found to be more rigid, more undependable, more likely to avoid compromise, more lacking in internal standards and less inclined to experiment, etc.—a complex that describes adaptive skills least likely to help them make the necessary adjustments to apply their functional skills effectively to a specific job-worker situation. Another example is the Lorton study, which is one of the best organized and executed examples of vocational training for prison inmates although it has disappointing results.

---

[2] Sidney A. Fine, "Nature of Skill: Implications for Education and Training," ***Proceedings, 75th Annual Convention*** (American Penal Association, 1967).

If the conceptualization offered here has merit, then we can see that we must find ways of training men whose adaptive skills are presently oriented to a criminal life to reorient their potential in more positive directions. How is this to be done? The answers are far from clear. However, we must recognize that the primitive, non-participative, initiative-destroying prison climate is hardly the way to reinforce positive adaptive skills. A more positive approach with better results has been demonstrated by the Residential Youth Center of the Psycho-Educational Clinic of Yale University in New Haven.[3] I commend your attention to this important work.

However, short of this total approach, you still can do things as teachers in a prison situation, and it is in this context that I feel that vocational education is as good a means as any to inculcate adaptive skills. This is done not by teaching[4]—you teach functional skills using vocational subjects—but by reinforcement of positive orientations, by setting an example, by caring and loving if possible, in short, by exploring the discretionary content of your jobs and making the most of it.

I hope my remarks are not understood to reflect my being opposed to research. This would be very inaccurate, since I am a researcher myself and strongly believe in it. However, what I am saying is that our actions now must follow from current wisdom, and that research is hardly more meaningful than the conceptualizations that initiate it and are then used to explain the results.

---

[3] Ira Goldenberg, "The Inner City Residential Youth Center as a Setting for Behavioral Change," ***Proceedings, 75th Annual Convention*** (American Penal Association, 1967).

[4] Adaptive skills seem to be taught/learned indirectly, by osmosis as it were, from the values, manners, and mores of those with whom one is in close association.

SYLVIA G. McCOLLUM
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

We all know that any research effort worthy of its mission will conclude on the note that the evidence available to date is inconclusive and that what is urgently needed *is more research*. It seems to me that we have been working toward that conclusion during the past two days.

Three of our speakers have suggested, although in some cases tentatively, that we have developed a rather impressive body of knowledge over recent years which can serve as the basis for new correctional education and related programs designed to change human attitudes and behavior. But each has, with varying degrees of urgency, pointed to the need for further research.

Professor Michael makes the strongest case for additional research. He states that what we currently really have is new *speculation* rather than new *knowledge*. He very carefully points to new *suggestive* evidence that there is a positive correlation between post-release success and correctional education. However, he cautions in almost all programs the student population was comprised of volunteers—and concludes ... "the fact of and the reasons for their volunteering may be the most significant fact of all."

What does all this add up to for the practitioner, the person involved in daily planning or action responsibilities in the correctional setting ?

The state of correctional education, or for that matter, the state of the total correctional process has so much room for improvement/that we really need not wait until the last research results are in. Thoughtful people in corrections advocate and support massive research efforts designed to develop more effective ways of working with troubled people wherever they may be, in or out of institutions. But we have not, at practically all levels of corrections, put to work the meager knowledge we already have.

We continue to use pen and pencil and verbal tests in the classification and assignment of most inmates to institutional programs; custody and institutional maintenance continue to take priority over rehabilitation and treatment efforts; educational and training programs where they exist are structured on the public school model—the same ineffective model which served as rejection and failure building mechanisms for the student inmate. New teaching methods, new instructional materials, new configurations of scheduling and use of inmate time, curriculums combining occupational and academic education geared to the interest level of the student, not the teacher; cluster skill training instead of the traditional dead-end, low-paid, single skill training; and other innovations too numerous to mention are still waiting in the wings of most correctional institutions. I guess this should not surprise us, since most of our children continue to be educated in our public schools with the same old enthusiasm-killing methods.

I would conclude that we need to proceed on several different levels in correctional education research and development.

1. First, more of us need to become vigorous spokesmen and advocates for the use of the new knowledge we already have. In addition, knowledgeable people in and out of corrections need to serve as technical assistants to those ready and willing to introduce new programs and institutional styles. The Federal Bureau of Prisons, those pioneer states who have the know-how, and community-based educators who have had experience in the educational world need to join forces to penetrate, to convert, to assist, to do whatever is necessary to update correctional education efforts throughout the country. If we are going to spend time and money on education and training, we ought to be spending these resources on first class programs. I would include here working toward integrating all institutional programs in the education and training effort so that the education and training potential in maintenance, custody, and prison industries be utilized wherever possible.

2. Second, I would urge research on a broader level, aimed at the kind of answers Jack Kaufman pointed toward yesterday. What is corrections really costing us? And this should include cost-effectiveness data for each of the component parts so that we start pricing out, for example, the cost of custody, education, maintenance, prison industries, etc.

Are there institutional configurations which can better effect change in human behavior and attitudes than the traditional correctional institution concept? What I'm striving for here is research which challenges the very foundations of the institution. There is a pressing need to think big and fundamentally.

Perhaps we will conclude that you cannot really rehabilitate anyone in the current typical correctional setting—that new institutions or new processes are needed. In many ways I felt that several speakers were suggesting changes of this magnitude.

I must conclude on an optimistic note, I sense and observe fundamental changes in the offing. Corrections seems poised and ready to move from the humane custody phase to effective treatment of deviant behavior. Education and training will play an ever increasing role in the treatment process.

LEON G. LEIBERG
NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

The scholarly paper presented by Professor Michael with respect to the correctional education process and how it affects the inmate is really mistitled. Rather than stress the dearth of studies and research in the field, it should have been a call to arms to bring attention and focus on an area of social need largely ignored and misunderstood, if of interest at all.

With the exception of the practitioners paying lip service to the need for correctional education and research and the correctional personnel satisfied that programs do take place during the long hours of the institutional day, interested educators from the open community are few in number and become suspect if they raise questions regarding the relevance of and need for the activities conducted in prisons.

Unlike any other modern, social, cooperative concept designed to bring about innovations in line with the requirements of a rapidly changing society, correctional education has not as yet been ready to step into the arena of modern educational practice and express willingness to engage in meaningful dialogue.

Not so surprisingly, the leadership to initiate change, to determine how better to meet apparent shortcomings, to do pilot studies of new approaches, to innovate, to experiment, and to demonstrate programs and methods which can point the way to economic participation and lower the rates of recidivism, was willingly provided by outsiders to the field of corrections.

The past few years have seen in the different geographical areas of the country a number of highly interesting programs emerge, which have dealt with skill training, remedial education, the techniques of counseling, job development and placement as well as the pre- and post-release supportive services directed to offenders.

The central theme has been and continues to be predicated on the assumption that remedial education supporting skill training, while not the whole of the rehabilitative process, is at the core of it and certainly relevant to the needs of the inmate rather than the institution.

While not denying the Hawthorne effect, these projects have also meant progress and an injection of action research into a field known for its minimal response to the needs of those it has responsibility for, and its refusal to recognize that social and economic deprivations are causative factors in crime.

For interest to be expressed and for change to be meaningful there has to be dissatisfaction with the status quo. Correctional educators seem to have remained curiously immune from the great currents of social change that have swept this country. There is very little interest in utilizing and/or at least testing the materials that have been developed for populations substantially similar to the ones found in the correctional institutions in the United States. The deprived, the economically disadvantaged, and the socially discriminated have always been handicapped by their problems being given little recognition. This has caused such a lack of productivity and participation that frequently their answer has been only to turn to crime.

While the correctional watchword has been on security requirements, this has also provided a cover for an unwillingness to change, and the stultification of the correctional mind at a loss to interpret and evaluate the relevant needs and problems of the times.

It is also fair to imply that the correctional leadership has not encouraged the controversial, fearing, no doubt, an involvement with the academic community more painful than progressive.

While so little is known about changes wrought in the attitudes and behavior of inmates and substantive data is lacking, the significance of the federally sponsored programs in federal, state, and local institutions cannot be simply laid to rest by saying that empirical studies are any less relevant than soundly based scientific studies done under optimal conditions of research.

We simply do not have the time, as a society, to continue the traditional ways of doing things without challenging their intrinsic purpose. Daniel Glaser's recommendations do not have to occur in sequence, but they have to become reality. It is essential to open the doors to the institutions to bring in the scholars, the researchers, the educators, and the businessmen as tangible evidence of interest and to create the favorable climate for positive change to take place in the institutions and in the men and women who serve time.

Proceedings of Other Conferences Sponsored by the Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education:

Occupational Data Requirements for Education Planning, June 15 and 16, 1965 $3.00 (Out of Print).

Research in Vocational and Technical Education, June 10 and 11, 1966 ($3.00).

Research in Apprenticeship Training, September 8 and 9, 1966 ($3.00)

Research Approaches to the Initiation of New Vocational-Technical Program, October 3 and 7, 1966 (Out of Print).

The Encouragement of Research in Predominantly Negro Universities, February 23, 1967 (Single copies available without charge).

The Education and Training of Racial Minorities, May 11 and 12, 1967 ($3.00 plus postage).

These may be obtained by writing:

Publications Office
Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education
Social Science Building
1180 Observatory Drive
The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706